

On conditional moments of high-dimensional random vectors given lower-dimensional projections

Lukas Steinberger and Hannes Leeb

University of Vienna

Abstract: One of the most widely used properties of the multivariate Gaussian distribution, besides its tail behavior, is the fact that conditional means are linear and that conditional variances are constant. We here show that this property is also shared, in an approximate sense, by a large class of non-Gaussian distributions. We allow for several conditioning variables and we provide explicit non-asymptotic results, whereby we extend earlier findings of [Hall and Li \(1993\)](#) and [Leeb \(2013a\)](#).

1. Introduction

1.1. Informal summary

The property of the multivariate Gaussian law, that conditional means are linear and that conditional variances are constant, is used by several fundamental statistical methods, even if these methods per se do not require Gaussianity: The generic linear model is built on the assumption that the conditional mean of the response is linear in the (conditioning) explanatory variables; and the generic homoskedastic linear model rests on the additional assumption that the conditional variance is constant. Linear conditional means and/or constant conditional variances are also assumed, for example, by methods for sufficient dimension reduction such as SIR ([Li, 1991](#)) or SAVE ([Cook and Weisberg, 1991](#)), or by certain imputation techniques ([Qu et al., 2010](#)). Elliptically contoured distributions are characterized by linear conditional means ([Eaton, 1986](#)). And methods for spatial statistics such as Kriging rely on Gaussianity mainly through the property that conditional means are linear and that conditional variances are constant.¹ But even though these properties are widely used, in a sense the only distribution that has both linear conditional means and constant conditional variances is the Gaussian (see also Section [1.2](#)).

In this paper, we show that conditional means are approximately linear and

¹ Distributions with linear conditional means and/or constant conditional variances are also studied, for example, in [Bryc and Wesołowski \(2005\)](#); [Cohen \(2012\)](#); [Jones \(1998\)](#); [Plucińska \(1983\)](#); [Tarpey and Sanders \(2004\)](#); [Wesołowski \(1993\)](#).

that conditional variances are approximately constant, for a large class of multivariate distributions, when the conditioning is on lower-dimensional projections. To illustrate our results, consider a random d -vector Z that has a Lebesgue density, and a $d \times p$ matrix B . Conditional on $B'Z$, we show that the mean of Z is linear in $B'Z$, and that the variance/covariance matrix of Z is constant, in an approximate sense. Typically, our approximation error bounds are small if d is sufficiently large relative to p . Our results extend recent findings of Leeb (2013a), where the case $p = 1$ is considered (which, from a modeling perspective, covers only models with one explanatory variable). More precisely, we extend and refine the results of Leeb (2013a) in three directions: First, we allow for the case where $p > 1$, thereby also proving a result that is outlined in Hall and Li (1993, Sect. 5). Second, we derive non-asymptotic and explicit error bounds that hold for fixed d , whereas Hall and Li (1993) and Leeb (2013a) only give asymptotic results that hold as $d \rightarrow \infty$; cf. Theorem 2.1. And third, we also give asymptotic results where p is allowed to increase with d ; see Corollary 2.3. In many cases, our error bounds go to zero if $p/\log d \rightarrow 0$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: We continue this section with a more detailed description of the results that we derive. Our main results are then stated in Section 2. And Section 3 gives a high-level description of the proof. The more technical low-level parts of the proof are collected in the appendix.

1.2. Outline of results

Consider a random d -vector Z that has a Lebesgue density, and that is centered and standardized so that $\mathbb{E}Z = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}ZZ' = I_d$. And take a $d \times p$ matrix B with orthonormal columns. [While we do rule out degenerate distributions, the requirement that Z is centered and standardized, and the requirement that the columns of B are orthonormal, are inconsequential; cf. Remark 1.1.] Our objective is to show that the conditional mean and the conditional variance of Z given $B'Z$ are close to what they would be if Z were Gaussian.

Instead of the conditional mean and variance, it will be convenient to focus on the first two conditional moments, i.e., on $\mathbb{E}[Z|B'Z]$ and on $\mathbb{E}[ZZ'|B'Z]$. If both the expressions

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}[Z|B'Z] - BB'Z \right\| \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \mathbb{E}[ZZ'|B'Z] - (I_d + B(B'ZZ'B - I_p)B') \right\|$$

are equal to zero, then the conditional mean of Z given $B'Z$ is linear in $B'Z$, and the corresponding conditional variance is constant in $B'Z$. But the only distribution, which satisfies this for all B , is the Gaussian law; cf. the discussion in Leeb (2013a, p. 466). We will show that a weaker form of this requirement, namely that the expressions in the preceding display are close to zero in probability for most B 's, is satisfied by a much larger class of distributions, provided mainly that d is sufficiently large relative to p .

For the case where $p = 1$, [Leeb \(2013a\)](#) showed, for each $t > 0$, that

$$\sup_{B \in G} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \mathbb{E}[Z \| B'Z] - BB'Z \right\| > t \right) \quad \text{and} \quad (1.1)$$

$$\sup_{B \in G} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \mathbb{E}[ZZ' \| B'Z] - (I_d + B(B'ZZ'B - I_p)B') \right\| > t \right) \quad (1.2)$$

converge to zero as $d \rightarrow \infty$, under some conditions, where the sets G are collections of $d \times p$ matrices with orthonormal columns that become large as $d \rightarrow \infty$. More precisely, for $\nu_{d,p}(\cdot)$ denoting the uniform distribution on the set of all such matrices (i.e., the Haar measure on the Stiefel manifold $\mathcal{V}_{d,p}$), the sets G satisfy $\nu_{d,p}(G) \rightarrow 1$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$. [Obviously, both G and $\nu_{d,p}$ depend on d and also on p , although this dependence is not shown explicitly in our notation.] In the case where $p = 1$ covered in [Leeb \(2013a\)](#), the sets G are collections of unit-vectors, and $\nu_{d,1}(\cdot)$ is the uniform distribution on the unit sphere, in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We derive a non-asymptotic version of this result, i.e., explicit upper bounds on (1.1) and (1.2), and also on $1 - \nu_{d,p}(G)$, that hold for fixed d and p , where we allow for $p > 1$; see Theorem 2.1. Moreover, we also provide an asymptotic result where our upper bounds go to zero as $d \rightarrow \infty$, where p may increase with d ; cf. Corollary 2.3. In many cases, our upper bounds are small, provided that $p/\log d$ is small. Both our non-asymptotic and our asymptotic result, i.e., both Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.3, hold uniformly over classes of distributions for Z , as outlined in Remark 2.2.

Of course, our results rely on further conditions on the distribution of Z (in addition to the existence of a Lebesgue density and the requirements that $\mathbb{E}Z = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}ZZ' = I_d$). In particular, we require that the mean of certain functions of Z , and of i.i.d. copies of Z , is bounded; see the bounds (b1).(a) and (b2), as well as the attending discussion in Section 2. And we require that certain moments of Z are close to what they would be in the Gaussian case; see (b1).(b-c). From a statistical perspective, we stress that our results rely on bounds that can be estimated from appropriate data, as outlined in the discussion leading up to Theorem 2.1. One particularly simple example, where these bounds obtain, and where the error bounds in Theorem 2.1 get small as d gets large, is the case where the components of Z are independent, with bounded marginal densities and bounded marginal moments of sufficiently large order; see Remark 2.4. Finally, we emphasize that (b1) and (b2) do not require that the components of Z are independent.

The results in this paper demonstrate that the requirement of linear conditional means and constant conditional variances (which is quite restrictive as discussed in the second paragraph of this subsection) is actually satisfied, in an approximate sense, by a rather large class of distributions. Some implications, namely to sparse linear modeling, and to sufficient dimension reduction methods like SIR or SAVE, are discussed in [Leeb \(2013a, Sect. 1.4\)](#). And while the discussion in [Leeb \(2013a\)](#) is hampered by the fact that only situations with $p = 1$, i.e., *only models with one explanatory variable*, are covered in that paper, our results show that these considerations extend also to the case where

$p > 1$, i.e., to more complex models with several explanatory variables.

Remark 1.1. (i) Our requirements, that the random d -vector Z is centered and standardized, and that the matrix B has orthonormal columns, are inconsequential in the following sense: Consider a random d -vector Y such that $\mathbb{E}[Y] = \mu$ and $\text{Var}[Y] = \Sigma$ are both well-defined and finite, and such that Y has a Lebesgue density (this also entails that Σ is invertible). Moreover, consider a $d \times p$ matrix A with linearly independent columns. If Y were Gaussian, we would have $\mathbb{E}[Y|A'Y] = \mu + \Sigma A(A'\Sigma A)^{-1}A'(Y - \mu)$. In general, one easily verifies that

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}[Y|A'Y] - (\mu + \Sigma A(A'\Sigma A)^{-1}A'(Y - \mu)) \right\| \leq \|\Sigma\|^{1/2} \left\| \mathbb{E}[Z|B'Z] - BB'Z \right\|$$

holds for $Z = \Sigma^{-1/2}(Y - \mu)$ and $B = \Sigma^{1/2}A(A'\Sigma A)^{-1/2}$. Note that Z has a Lebesgue density; that Z is centered and standardized so that $\mathbb{E}[Z] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[ZZ'] = I_d$; and that the columns of B are orthonormal. In particular, we see that the conditional mean of Y given $A'Y$ is approximately linear if the same is true for the conditional mean of Z given $B'Z$, provided only that the largest eigenvalue of Σ is not too large. A similar consideration applies, mutatis mutandis, to the conditional variance of Y given $A'Y$ and that of Z given $B'Z$. (ii) Conditioning on $B'Z$ is equivalent to conditioning on $BB'Z$, which is the orthogonal projection of Z onto the column space of B . Therefore, we could formulate Theorem 2.1 for collections of p -dimensional subspaces S of $\mathbb{R}^d$ (elements of the Grassmann manifold $\mathcal{G}_{d,p}$) instead of matrices B (from the Stiefel manifold $\mathcal{V}_{d,p}$), and thus replace (1.1) by

$$\sup_{S \in H} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \mathbb{E}[Z|P_S Z] - P_S Z \right\| > t \right),$$

with P_S denoting the orthogonal projection matrix for the subspace S . Here, H denotes the image of the set $G \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ from (1.1) under the mapping that maps a matrix B into its column space S . Note that the image of the Haar measure on $\mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ under this mapping is the Haar measure on $\mathcal{G}_{d,p}$; see also Chikuse (2003, Theorem 2.2.2(iii)). In a similar manner, one can also write (1.2) in terms of the Grassmann manifold, namely as

$$\sup_{S \in H} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \mathbb{E}[ZZ'|P_S Z] - (I_d - P_S + P_S Z(P_S Z)') \right\| > t \right).$$

2. Results

We first present our main non-asymptotic result, i.e., Theorem 2.1, and the bounds (b1) and (b2) that it relies on. These bounds depend on a constant k that will be chosen as needed later. In Corollary 2.3 and the attending discussion, we then present asymptotic scenarios in which the constants in (b1) and (b2) can be controlled, such that the error bounds in Theorem 2.1 become small.

Throughout, consider a random d -vector Z that has a Lebesgue density and that satisfies $\mathbb{E}Z = 0$ as well as $\mathbb{E}ZZ' = I_d$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, write $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$ for i.i.d. copies of Z , and write S_k for the $k \times k$ Gram-matrix $S_k = (Z_i'Z_j/d)_{i,j=1}^k$.

- (b1) For fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there are constants $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/2]$, $\alpha \geq 1$, $\beta > 0$, and $\xi \in (0, 1/2]$, such that the following holds true:
- (a) $\mathbb{E}\|\sqrt{d}(S_k - I_k)\|^{2k+1+\varepsilon} \leq \alpha$.
 - (b) For any monomial $G = G(S_k - I_k)$ in the elements of $S_k - I_k$, whose degree g satisfies $g \leq 2k$, we have $|d^{g/2}\mathbb{E}G - 1| \leq \beta/d^\xi$ if G consists only of quadratic terms in elements above the diagonal, and $|d^{g/2}\mathbb{E}G| \leq \beta/d^\xi$ if G contains a linear term.
 - (c) Consider two monomials $G = G(S_k - I_k)$ and $H = H(S_k - I_k)$ of degree g and h , respectively, in the elements of $S_k - I_k$. If G is given by $Z_1'Z_2Z_2'Z_3 \dots Z_{g-1}'Z_gZ_g'Z_1/d^g$, if H depends at least on those Z_i 's with $i \leq g$, and if $2 \leq h < g \leq k$, then $|d^g\mathbb{E}GH| \leq \beta/d^\xi$.
- (b2) For fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a constant $D \geq 1$, such that the following holds true: If R is an orthogonal $d \times d$ matrix, then a marginal density of the first $d - k + 1$ components of RZ is bounded by $\binom{d}{k-1}^{1/2} D^{d-k+1}$.

The bounds in (b1) are non-asymptotic versions of condition (t1) in Leeb (2013a), and the bound in (b2) coincides with condition (t2) in that reference. The bounds in (b1).(b-c) are written as β/d^ξ , because in Corollary 2.3 we will consider situations where these bounds hold for constants β and ξ that either are both independent of d , or that are such that β is independent of d while ξ depends on d so that $1/d^\xi \rightarrow 0$. The bound in (b2) appears to be qualitatively different from (b1) in that it does not directly impose restrictions to moments of the standardized Gram matrix $S_k - I_k$. However, (b2) is used only to bound the p -th moment of $\det S_l^{-4(k+1)}$ for $l = 1, \dots, k$; cf. Lemma D.5 and the proof of Proposition 3.4 in the appendix. From a statistical perspective, we note that the moment-bounds discussed here can be estimated from a sample of independent copies of Z . Indeed, population means like $\mathbb{E}\|S_k - I_k\|^{2k+1+\varepsilon}$, $\mathbb{E}G$, $\mathbb{E}GH$, or $\mathbb{E}\det S_l^{-4p(k+1)}$ as above are readily estimated by appropriate sample means. In this sense, we rely on bounds that can be estimated from data.

Theorem 2.1. *For fixed d , consider a random d -vector Z that has a Lebesgue density and that is standardized such that $\mathbb{E}Z = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}ZZ' = I_d$.*

(i) *Suppose that (b1).(a-b) and (b2) hold with $k = 2$. Then, for each $p < d$ and for each $\tau \in (0, 1)$, there is a Borel set $G \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ such that (1.1) is bounded by*

$$\frac{1}{t} d^{-\tau\xi_1} + \frac{\gamma_1}{1-\tau} \frac{p}{3\xi_1 \log d}$$

for each $t > 0$, and such that

$$\nu_{d,p}(G^c) \leq \kappa_1 d^{-\tau\xi_1} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_1}{\tau} \frac{p}{\xi_1 \log d}\right),$$

where ξ_1 is given by $\xi_1 = \min\{\xi, \varepsilon/2 + 1/4, 1/2\}/3$. Here, the constant γ_1 depends only on D while the constant κ_1 depends only on α and β .

(ii) Suppose that (b1).(a-c) and (b2) hold with $k = 4$. Then, for each $p < d$ and for each $\tau \in (0, 1)$, there is a Borel set $G \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ so that both (1.1) and (1.2) are bounded by

$$\frac{1}{t} d^{-\tau\xi_2} + \frac{\gamma_2}{1-\tau} \frac{p}{5\xi_2 \log d}$$

for each $t > 0$, and such that

$$\nu_{d,p}(G^c) \leq 2\kappa_2 d^{-\tau\xi_2 \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_2}{\tau} \frac{p}{\xi_2 \log d}\right)}.$$

Here, ξ_2 is given by $\xi_2 = \min\{\xi, \varepsilon/2 + 1/4, 1/2\}/5$, the constant γ_2 depends only on D , and κ_2 depends only on α and β .

The constants γ_1 , γ_2 , κ_1 and κ_2 in part (i) and (ii) can be obtained explicitly upon detailed inspection of the proof.

With Theorem 2.1, we aimed to obtain the best possible upper bounds for (1.1), (1.2) and $\nu_{d,p}(G^c)$ that our current technique of proof delivers. It is likely that better bounds can be obtained under stronger assumptions (like in the case where the components of Z are independent) together with an alternative method of proof. In particular, when bounding (1.1) in Theorem 2.1(i), the term $\frac{\gamma_1}{1-\tau} \frac{p}{3\xi_1 \log d}$ is obtained by bounding $\mathbb{P}(\|B'Z\|^2 > (1-\tau)3\xi_1 \log(d)/\gamma_1)$ using Chebyshev's inequality; cf. the proof of Lemma A.2 in the appendix. Under appropriate additional assumptions on the tails of $\|B'Z\|$, this bound can be dramatically improved. The bound on both (1.1) and (1.2) in Theorem 2.1(ii) can be improved in a similar fashion. When proving Theorem 2.1, we derive upper bounds for (1.1) and (1.2), on the one hand, and for $\nu_{d,p}(G^c)$, on the other hand, that are antagonistic in the sense that one can be reduced at the expense of the other (namely in the proof of Lemma A.2). For Theorem 2.1, we have balanced these bounds so that both are of the same leading order in d , i.e., $d^{-\tau\xi_1}$ in part (i) and $d^{-\tau\xi_2}$ in part (ii).

Remark 2.2. Because the error bounds in Theorem 2.1 depend on Z only through the constants that occur in (b1) and (b2), the theorem a fortiori holds uniformly over the class of all distributions for Z that satisfy (b1) and (b2). For example: Fix constants ε , α , β and ξ as in (b1), fix D as in (b2), and write $\mathcal{Z}$ for the class of all random d -vectors Z that satisfy the bounds (b1).(a-c) and (b2) for $k = 4$, that have a Lebesgue density, and that are centered and standardized. Then, for each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and for each $p < d$, there exists a Borel set $G \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ (that depends on Z), so that (1.1), (1.2) and also $\nu_{d,p}(G^c)$ are bounded as in Theorem 2.1(ii). Similar considerations also apply, mutatis mutandis, to Theorem 2.1(i) and to the following corollary.

Corollary 2.3. For each d , consider a random d -vector $Z^{(d)}$ that has a Lebesgue density and that satisfies $\mathbb{E}Z^{(d)} = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}Z^{(d)}Z^{(d)'} = I_d$. And for each d , suppose that (b1).(a-c) and (b2) hold with $Z^{(d)}$ replacing Z and with $k = 4$, such

that the constants ε , α , β , and D in these bounds do not depend on d , while the constant $\xi = \xi_d$ in (b1) may depend on d as long as $d^{-\xi_d} \rightarrow 0$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, consider a sequence of integers $p_d < d$ such that $p_d/(\xi_d \log d) \rightarrow 0$. Then Theorem 2.1.(ii) applies for each d , with $Z^{(d)}$ and p_d replacing Z and p , respectively, and the error bounds provided in the theorem go to zero as $d \rightarrow \infty$.

Corollary 2.3 provides an asymptotic version of Theorem 2.1.(ii). Similarly, an asymptotic version of Theorem 2.1.(i) can also be obtained, mutatis mutandis. This provides a direct extension of Theorem 2.1 of Leeb (2013a) from the case $p = 1$ covered in that reference to the case where $p > 1$, also allowing for p to grow with d . [Indeed, it is elementary to verify that conditions (t1) and (t2) with $k = 4$ in Leeb (2013a) imply that the conditions of the corollary are satisfied with $\varepsilon = 0$ and for some sequence ξ_d such that $d^{-\xi_d} \rightarrow 0$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$. And if (t1) and (t2) hold with $k = 2$, one obtains conditions that imply an asymptotic version of Theorem 2.1.(i).]

If Corollary 2.3 applies with constants ξ_d satisfying $\xi_d \rightarrow \xi_\infty > 0$ (e.g., in the case where the ξ_d 's do not depend on d , which is also discussed in the following paragraph), the corollary's requirement on p_d reduces to $p_d = o(\log d)$. In that case, the bounds on $\nu_{d,p}(G^c)$ in Theorem 2.1 are of polynomial order in d . But if Corollary 2.3 applies with $\xi_d \rightarrow 0$, then the stronger requirement $p_d = o(\xi_d \log d)$ is needed, and the bounds on $\nu_{d,p}(G^c)$ in Theorem 2.1 are of slower order in d . Note that $d^{-\xi_d} \rightarrow 0$ entails that $\xi_d \log d \rightarrow \infty$, so that the constant sequence $p_d = p$ always satisfies the growth condition in Corollary 2.3.

Remark 2.4. A particularly simple scenario, where Corollary 2.3, and hence also Theorem 2.1(i)-(ii), applies, is the case where, for each d , the components of Z are independent with bounded marginal densities and bounded marginal moments of sufficiently high order (where the bounds do not depend on d). In that case, Corollary 2.3 applies with both ε and ξ_d equal to $1/2$. In particular, $\xi = \xi_d$ is independent of d here. [For details, see Example A.1 in Leeb (2013b).]

3. Proof of Theorem 2.1

The following subsections provide a high-level description of the proof. More technical low-level details are given in the appendix. Our arguments have the same basic structure as those used in Leeb (2013a). To prove Theorem 2.1, however, the arguments from Leeb (2013a) require substantial extensions and modifications, because many of the arguments used in that reference are of an asymptotic nature and do not provide explicit error bounds, and because all of these arguments rely heavily on the assumption that p is fixed and equal to 1.

3.1. Two crucial bounds

Throughout, fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and let Z be as in Theorem 2.1, i.e., a random d -vector that has a Lebesgue density and that is standardized so that $\mathbb{E}Z = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}ZZ' = I_d$. [The particular assumptions of part (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.1 will be imposed as needed later.] We will study the following quantities: For a positive integer $p < d$, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and for $B \in \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$, set $\mu_{x|B} = \mathbb{E}[Z \| B'Z = x]$, $\Delta_{x|B} = \mathbb{E}[ZZ' \| B'Z = x] - (I_d + B(xx' - I_p)B')$, and $h(x|B) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})}\right]$, where f is a Lebesgue density of Z , $W^{x|B} = Bx + (I_d - BB')V$, and ϕ denotes a Lebesgue density of $V \sim N(0, I_d)$. Note that these quantities, if considered as functions with domain $\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$, can be chosen to be measurable; cf. Lemma A.1. Finally, write $\mathcal{S}_{M,p}$ for the closed ball of radius M in $\mathbb{R}^p$, i.e., $\mathcal{S}_{M,p} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|x\| \leq M\}$.

We now introduce two bounds which will play an essential role in the proof of Theorem 2.1. In each bound, the quantity of interest, which will be introduced shortly, will be bounded by an expression of the form

$$p^{2k+1+\varepsilon} e^{gM^2} (2D\sqrt{\pi e})^{pk} d^{-\min\{\xi, \varepsilon/2+1/4, 1/2\}} \kappa \quad (3.1)$$

for some even integer k , where the precise value of the constants in the bound will depend on the context, i.e., these constants will be chosen as needed later.

The first crucial bound implies the first part of Theorem 2.1: Under the assumptions of the Theorem 2.1(i), we will show that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}} \int [\|\mu_{x|B}\|^2 - \|x\|^2] h(x|B)^2 d\nu_{d,p}(B) \quad (3.2)$$

is bounded by (3.1) for $k = 2$, for every $M > 1$ and every $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d > \max\{4(k+p+1)M^4, 2k+p(2k+2)2^{k+3}, p^2\}$, where $\kappa = \kappa_1 \geq 1$ is a constant that depends only on α and β , and where $g = g_1$ is a global constant. The remaining constants occurring here, i.e., ε , α , β , ξ , and D , are those that appear in the bounds (b1).(a-b) and (b2) imposed by Theorem 2.1(i). Once that statement has been derived, the proof of Theorem 2.1(i) is easily completed by standard arguments (that are detailed in Lemma A.2(i)).

The second crucial bound similarly delivers the second part of Theorem 2.1: Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1(ii), we will show that (3.2) and

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}} \int \text{trace } \Delta_{x|B}^k h(x|B)^k d\nu_{d,p}(B) \quad (3.3)$$

are both bounded by (3.1) for $k = 4$, for every $M > 1$ and every $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d > \max\{4(k+p+1)M^4, 2k+p(2k+2)2^{k+3}, p^2\}$, where $\kappa = \kappa_2 \geq 1$ depends only on α and β , and where $g = g_2$ is a global constant. Again, the remaining constants ε , α , β , ξ , and D are those that appear in the bounds (b1) and (b2)

imposed by Theorem 2.1(ii). From this statement, standard arguments complete the proof of Theorem 2.1(ii); cf. Lemma A.2(ii).

It turns out that in order to derive the upper bounds for (3.2) and (3.3), it will be instrumental to show that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}} \int [h(x|B) - 1]^2 d\nu_{d,p}(B) \quad (3.4)$$

is finite. In particular, we will need to establish finiteness of (3.4) for every M and p as in (3.2) to derive the desired bound on (3.2), and for every M and p as in (3.3) for the bound on (3.3). We will in fact show more than that, namely that (3.4) is also bounded by (3.1), under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1(i) and for constants as in (3.2), and also under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1(ii) and for constants as in (3.3).

We pause here for a moment to discuss a weaker version of Theorem 2.1 which also allows us to better appreciate the importance of (3.4) (the exact role of (3.4) in the main argument will become apparent later, after Proposition 3.1): Assume in this paragraph that (3.2), (3.3), and (3.4) are all bounded by (3.1) with $k = 4$, for each $M > 1$, and for *each sufficiently large* d . [The other constants in the bound, i.e., p , ε , g , D , ξ and κ , are assumed to be fixed, independent of d here.] Under this assumption, we immediately obtain the following weaker version of Corollary 2.3: For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}[Z\|\mathbf{B}'Z = x] - \mathbf{B}x\|^2 &\xrightarrow{p} 0, \\ \|\mathbb{E}[ZZ'\|\mathbf{B}'Z = x] - (I_d + \mathbf{B}(xx' - I_p)\mathbf{B}')\| &\xrightarrow{p} 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $d \rightarrow \infty$, if $\mathbf{B}$ is a random matrix that is uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{V}_{d,p}$. After noting that $\|\mathbb{E}[Z\|\mathbf{B}'Z = x] - \mathbf{B}x\|^2$ can also be written as $\|\mathbb{E}[Z\|\mathbf{B}'Z = x]\|^2 - \|x\|^2$, this is an easy consequence of Markov's inequality and Slutsky's Lemma.² [Choose $M \geq \|x\|$ and observe that the upper bound (3.1) converges to zero as $d \rightarrow \infty$, so that also the three quantities in (3.2), (3.3), and (3.4) converge to zero. Now convergence of (3.4) to zero entails that $h(x|\mathbf{B})$ converges to one in squared mean. Convergence of (3.2) to zero implies that $[\|\mathbb{E}[Z\|\mathbf{B}'Z = x]\|^2 - \|x\|^2] h(x|\mathbf{B})^2$ converges to zero in expectation. Similarly, convergence of (3.3) to zero implies that $\text{trace} \Delta_{x|\mathbf{B}}^4 h(x|\mathbf{B})^4$ converges to zero in expectation. Because the involved random variables are all non-negative, the first relation in the preceding display follows from Markov's inequality and Slutsky's Lemma. The second relation follows in a similar fashion upon observing that the symmetry of $\Delta_{x|\mathbf{B}}$ entails that $\|\Delta_{x|\mathbf{B}}\|^4$ is bounded from above by $\text{trace} \Delta_{x|\mathbf{B}}^4$.]

In this subsection, we have seen that to prove Theorem 2.1(i), it suffices to show, under the assumptions maintained there, that both (3.2) and (3.4)

² A proof of the first statement in the preceding display was already sketched in Hall and Li (1993) as an immediate generalization of the case where $p = 1$ proved therein. See also Leeb (2013a) for further discussion of that result.

are bounded by (3.1) for constants as in (3.2). And, similarly, to prove Theorem 2.1(ii), it remains to show, under the assumptions maintained there, that (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) are all bounded by (3.1) for constants as in (3.3).

3.2. Changing the reference measure

Throughout the following, set

$$W_j = \mathbf{B}x + (I_d - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}')V_j, \quad (3.5)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, k$, where $\mathbf{B}, V_1, \dots, V_k$ are independent such that $\mathbf{B}$ is a random $d \times p$ matrix with distribution $\nu_{d,p}$ and such that each of the V_i 's is distributed as $N(0, I_d)$. We call $W_1, \dots, W_k$ the ‘rotational clones’, in analogy to the name ‘rotational twins’ that Hall and Li (1993) use for the pair W_1, W_2 in case $p = 1$. With this, we may re-write the integral in (3.4) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})} \right] \right)^2 - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})} \right] + 1 \, d\nu_{d,p}(B) \\ &= \int \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(Bx + (I_d - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}')V_1)}{\phi(Bx + (I_d - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}')V_1)} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(Bx + (I_d - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}')V_2)}{\phi(Bx + (I_d - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}')V_2)} \right] d\nu_{d,p}(B) \\ & \quad - 2 \int \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(Bx + (I_d - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}')V_1)}{\phi(Bx + (I_d - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}')V_1)} \right] d\nu_{d,p}(B) + 1 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(W_1)}{\phi(W_1)} \frac{f(W_2)}{\phi(W_2)} - 1 \right] - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(W_1)}{\phi(W_1)} - 1 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

provided that the expected values in (3.6) are all finite. And, clearly, if both expected values in (3.6) are bounded by (3.1) in absolute value, then (3.6) is bounded by three times the expression in (3.1). To establish the desired bounds on (3.2) and (3.3) it will be convenient to also express the integrals in (3.2) and (3.3) in terms of W_i 's. This can be accomplished by virtue of the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Fix $d \geq p \geq 1$, and consider a random d -vector Z with Lebesgue density f . Let $V \sim N(0, I_d)$, and write $\phi(\cdot)$ for a Lebesgue density of V . Moreover, for a fixed $d \times p$ -matrix $B \in \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ and for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, set $W^{x|B} = Bx + (I_d - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}')V$. Then the function $h(\cdot|B) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by*

$$h(x|B) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})} \right]$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a density of $B'Z$ with respect to the p -variate standard Gaussian measure (i.e., $h(x|B)\phi_p(x)$ is a Lebesgue density of $B'Z$ if ϕ_p denotes a $N_p(0, I_p)$ -density). Moreover, if $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\Psi(Z)$ is integrable, then a conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[\Psi(Z)|B'Z = x]$ of $\Psi(Z)$ given $B'Z = x$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Psi(Z) \middle| B'Z = x \right] h(x|B) = \mathbb{E} \left[\Psi(W^{x|B}) \frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})} \right]$$

whenever $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is such that $h(x|B) < \infty$.

Note that this proposition applies under the assumptions of both parts of Theorem 2.1. Assume therefore that Proposition 3.1 is applicable throughout the rest of this subsection. The integral in (3.2) can then be re-written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int [\|\mu_{x|B}\|^2 - \|x\|^2] h(x|B)^2 d\nu_{d,p}(B) \\
&= \int \|\mu_{x|B} h(x|B)\|^2 d\nu_{d,p}(B) - \|x\|^2 \int h(x|B)^2 d\nu_{d,p}(B) \\
&= \int \mathbb{E} \left[W^{x|B} \frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})} \right]' \mathbb{E} \left[W^{x|B} \frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})} \right] d\nu_{d,p}(B) \\
&\quad - \|x\|^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(W_1)}{\phi(W_1)} \frac{f(W_2)}{\phi(W_2)} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[(W_1' W_2 - \|x\|^2) \frac{f(W_1)}{\phi(W_1)} \frac{f(W_2)}{\phi(W_2)} \right], \tag{3.7}
\end{aligned}$$

provided that the expected values in (3.6) and (3.7) are all finite. [Indeed, finiteness of the expected values in (3.6) entails that $\int [h(x|B) - 1]^2 d\nu_{d,p}(B)$ is finite, so that $\nu_{d,p}\{B : h(x|B) = \infty\} = 0$, whence Proposition 3.1 can be used to obtain the second equality in the preceding display. The first and the third equality follow from finiteness of the expected values in (3.6) and (3.7).]

To express the integral in (3.3) in a similar way, define $\Delta_{x|B}(z) : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{V}_{d,p} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ by $\Delta_{x|B}(z) = zz' - (I_d + B(xx' - I_p)B')$, and use Proposition 3.1 component-wise with $\Psi_{i,j}(Z) = [\Delta_{x|B}(Z)]_{i,j}$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, d$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \text{trace } \Delta_{x|B}^k h(x|B)^k d\nu_{d,p}(B) \\
&= \int \text{trace} \left\{ (\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{x|B}(Z) \|B'Z = x] h(x|B))^k \right\} d\nu_{d,p}(B) \\
&= \int \text{trace} \left\{ \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\Delta_{x|B}(W^{x|B}) \frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})} \right] \right)^k \right\} d\nu_{d,p}(B) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{trace } \Delta_{x|B}(W_1) \cdots \Delta_{x|B}(W_k) \frac{f(W_1)}{\phi(W_1)} \cdots \frac{f(W_k)}{\phi(W_k)} \right], \tag{3.8}
\end{aligned}$$

provided that the expected values in (3.6) and (3.8) are all finite. Lemma B.1 describes how the expression in (3.8) can be written as a weighted sum of expressions that, similarly to (3.7), involve only inner products of W_i 's and a product of density ratios. In particular, we find that (3.8) can be written as a weighted

sum of terms of the form

$$\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[(W'_1 W_2 \cdots W_j W'_j W_1 - d + p - \|x\|^2)^j \frac{f(W_1)}{\phi(W_1)} \cdots \frac{f(W_k)}{\phi(W_k)} \right], \text{ and}$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m W'_{j_{i-1}+1} W_{j_{i-1}+2} W'_{j_{i-1}+2} \cdots W'_{j_{i-1}} W_{j_i} - \|x\|^{2(j_m-m)} \right) \frac{f(W_1)}{\phi(W_1)} \cdots \frac{f(W_k)}{\phi(W_k)} \right] \quad (3.9)$$

for $m \geq 1$ and indices $j_0, \dots, j_m$ satisfying $j_0 = 0$, $j_m < k$, and $j_{i-1} + 1 < j_i$ whenever $1 \leq i \leq m$, provided that the expected values in (3.9) are all finite. [Note that these requirements entail that $m \leq k/2$, and that there are no more than $\binom{k}{m}$ choices for the indices $j_0, \dots, j_m$ in the second expected value in (3.9).] Lemma B.1 also shows that the weights in this expansion of (3.8) only depend on k and on x , and are polynomials in $\|x\|^2$. Note that hence all the weights are bounded, in absolute value and uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, by $e^{c(k)M^2}$ for some constant $c(k)$ that depends only on k . In particular, if the expected values in (3.9) are all bounded by (3.1) in absolute value, then the same is true for (3.8) or, equivalently, (3.3) upon replacing the constants g and κ in (3.1) by, say, $g + c(k)$ and $(1 + (k/2)\binom{k}{k/2})\kappa$, respectively.

In this subsection, we have seen how the integrals in (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) can be re-written as weighted sums of expected values involving the rotational clones, provided these expected values are all finite. To prove Theorem 2.1(i), it thus remains to show, under the maintained assumptions, that the expected values in (3.6) and (3.7) are all bounded by (3.1) in absolute value, uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and for constants as in (3.2). And Theorem 2.1(ii) follows if, under the assumptions of that theorem, the expected values in (3.6) and (3.7) as well as all the expressions in (3.9) are bounded by (3.1) in absolute value, uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and for constants as in (3.3).

3.3. The joint density of the ‘rotational clones’

Proposition 3.2. *For integers $1 \leq p < d$ and $1 \leq k \leq d-p$, let $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and let $W_1, \dots, W_k$ be as in (3.5). Then $W_1, \dots, W_k$ have a joint density $\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k)$ with respect to Lebesgue measure which satisfies*

$$\frac{\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k)}{\phi(w_1) \cdots \phi(w_k)} = \left(\frac{d}{2} \right)^{-\frac{pk}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{\Gamma((d-i+1)/2)}{\Gamma((d-p-i+1)/2)} \det(S_k)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \left(1 - \frac{\|x\|^2}{d} \iota' S_k^{-1} \iota \right)^{\frac{d-p-k-1}{2}} e^{\frac{k}{2}\|x\|^2}$$

if S_k is invertible with $\|x\|^2 \iota' S_k^{-1} \iota < d$, and $\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k) = 0$ otherwise, where $S_k = (w'_i w_j / d)_{i,j=1}^k$ denotes the $k \times k$ matrix of scaled inner products of the w_i ’s, and $\iota = (1, \dots, 1)'$ denotes an appropriate vector of ones.

If, in addition, $k < d - p - 1$, then the normalizing constant in the preceding display, i.e., the quantity $\eta(d, p, k) = (d/2)^{-kp/2} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{\Gamma((d-i+1)/2)}{\Gamma((d-p-i+1)/2)}$ satisfies

$$0 < \eta(d, p, k) \leq \exp \left[\frac{p^2}{d} \left(1 - \frac{p+k-1}{d} \right)^{-1} \frac{k^2}{2} \right].$$

Note that Proposition 3.2 applies whenever p , d , and k are as in (3.2) or (3.3). For p , d , and k as in Proposition 3.2, we can re-express the expression in (3.6) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(W_1)}{\phi(W_1)} \frac{f(W_2)}{\phi(W_2)} - 1 \right] - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f(W_1)}{\phi(W_1)} - 1 \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{f(w_1)}{\phi(w_1)} \frac{f(w_2)}{\phi(w_2)} - 1 \right) \varphi_x(w_1, w_2) dw_1 dw_2 \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{f(w_1)}{\phi(w_1)} - 1 \right) \varphi_x(w_1) dw_1 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, Z_2)}{\phi(Z_1)\phi(Z_2)} - 1 \right] - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\varphi_x(Z_1)}{\phi(Z_1)} - 1 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

we can re-write (3.7) as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(Z'_1 Z_2 - \|x\|^2) \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, Z_2)}{\phi(Z_1)\phi(Z_2)} \right], \quad (3.11)$$

and the expressions in (3.9) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(Z'_1 Z_2 \cdots Z'_j Z_j Z_1 - d + p - \|x\|^{2j} \right) \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} \right], \\ & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m Z'_{j_{i-1}+1} Z_{j_{i-1}+2} \cdots Z'_{j_{i-1}} Z_{j_i} - \|x\|^{2(j_m-m)} \right) \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

for $m \geq 1$ and indices $j_0, \dots, j_m$ satisfying $j_0 = 0$, $j_m < k$, and $j_{i-1} + 1 < j_i$ whenever $1 \leq i \leq m$.

In this subsection, we have seen how the integrals in (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) can be re-written as weighted sums of expected values involving i.i.d. copies of Z and the density of the rotational clones, provided these expected values are all finite. Theorem 2.1(i) now follows if we can show that the expected values in (3.10) and (3.11) are all bounded by (3.1) in absolute value, uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and for constants as in (3.2), under the assumptions of that theorem. Similarly, Theorem 2.1(ii) follows, provided the expected values in (3.10) and (3.11) as well as all the expressions in (3.12) are bounded by (3.1) in absolute value, uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and for constants as in (3.3), under the assumptions of that theorem.

3.4. Two sufficient conditions

For an even integer k , consider the quantities

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m Z'_{j_{i-1}+1} Z_{j_{i-1}+2} \cdots Z'_{j_i-1} Z_{j_i} \right) \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_l)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_l)} \right] - \|x\|^{2(j_m-m)} \quad (3.13)$$

for $l = 1, \dots, k$, for each $m \geq 0$, and for each set of indices $j_0, \dots, j_m$ that satisfies $j_0 = 0$, $j_m \leq l$ and $j_{i-1} + 1 < j_i$ whenever $1 \leq i \leq m$. And, again for even k , consider

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[(Z'_1 Z_2 \cdots Z_j Z'_j Z_1 - d + p - 1) \right. \\ \left. \times \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} \right] - (1 - \|x\|^2)^k. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

If the expressions of the form (3.13) are all bounded by (3.1), in absolute value and with constants as in (3.2), then both the expected values in (3.10) and (3.11) are also bounded by (3.1), again in absolute value and for constants as in (3.2). Indeed, the two expected values in (3.10) are special cases of (3.13), namely with $m = 0$ and $l = 1$, and with $m = 0$ and $l = 2$, respectively. Similarly, one sees that (3.11) equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(Z'_1 Z_2) \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, Z_2)}{\phi(Z_1)\phi(Z_2)} - \|x\|^2 \right] - \|x\|^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, Z_2)}{\phi(Z_1)\phi(Z_2)} - 1 \right].$$

Note that the two expected values in the preceding display are special cases of (3.13), namely with $m = 1$, $l = 2$ and with $m = 0$, $l = 2$. If these special cases of (3.13) are both bounded by (3.1) in absolute value, uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and for constants as in (3.2), then the expression in the preceding display is similarly bounded by the product of (3.1) and $1 + M^2$. It is now easy to see that the resulting upper bound on the expression in the preceding display, and hence also on (3.11), is itself upper bounded by an expression of the form (3.1) for constants as in (3.2).

Similarly, if the expressions of the form (3.13) and also (3.14) are bounded by (3.1), in absolute value and with constants as in (3.3), then the expected values in (3.10) and (3.11) as well as all the expressions in (3.12) are also bounded by (3.1), again in absolute value and for constants as in (3.3). Indeed, (3.10) can be bounded as claimed by arguing as in the preceding paragraph. For (3.12), we

re-write the first expression in that display as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[(Z'_1 Z_2 \cdots Z_j Z'_j Z_1 - d + p - \|x\|^{2j}) \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} \right] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[(Z'_1 Z_2 \cdots Z_j Z'_j Z_1 - d + p - 1) \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} \right] \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} (1 - \|x\|^{2j}) \\
&= (3.14) + (1 - \|x\|^2)^k - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} \right] (1 - \|x\|^2)^k \\
&= (3.14) - (1 - \|x\|^2)^k \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} - 1 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is obtained from the binomial formula upon recalling that k is even. From this, the first expression in (3.12) can be bounded by an expression of the form (3.1), namely by first bounding both (3.13) and (3.14) with $m = 0$ and $l = k$ by (3.1), by using the fact that $(1 - \|x\|^2)^k \leq 2^k M^{2k}$ for $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and by adjusting the constants κ and g in (3.1) accordingly. The second expression in (3.12) can be bounded in a similar fashion upon using appropriate bounds on (3.13).

In this subsection, we have seen how bounds on the expressions of the form (3.13) and on (3.14) can be used to prove both parts of Theorem 2.1. In particular, Theorem 2.1(i) follows if, under the assumptions of that theorem, the expressions of the form (3.13) are all bounded by (3.1), in absolute value, uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and for constants as in (3.2). And Theorem 2.1(ii) follows if the expressions of the form (3.13) and also (3.14) are all bounded by (3.1), in absolute value, uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and for constants as in (3.3), under the assumptions of that theorem.

3.5. Approximating the density ratio

Proposition 3.3. *Fix $M > 1$, positive integers k, d , and p , such that $d > p^2$ and $d > 4(k + p + 1)M^4$ and let $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$. For a collection of d -vectors $w_1, \dots, w_k$, define the $k \times k$ -matrix $S_k = (w'_i w_j / d)_{i,j=1}^k$. Then the density ratio $\frac{\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k)}{\phi(w_1) \cdots \phi(w_k)}$ can be expanded as*

$$\frac{\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k)}{\phi(w_1) \cdots \phi(w_k)} = \psi_x(S_k - I_k) + \Delta,$$

where the quantities on the right hand side have the following properties:

ψ_x is a polynomial of degree k in the elements of $S_k - I_k$ whose coefficients are bounded by $p^k M^{2(k+2)} C_\psi(k)$, where $C_\psi(k)$ depends only on k . In particular,

we may write

$$\psi_x(S_k - I_k) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{M}_k} \mathcal{C}(H) H(S_k - I_k),$$

where $\mathcal{M}_k$ is the set of all monomials in the entries of a symmetric $k \times k$ -matrix (i.e., in $k(k+1)/2$ variables) up to degree k and $\mathcal{C}(H) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the coefficient in ψ_x corresponding to the monomial H , which satisfies $|\mathcal{C}(H)| \leq p^k M^{2(k+2)} C_\psi(k)$. In addition, the coefficients $\mathcal{C}(H)$ are invariant under permutations in the following sense: Define the function g by $g(w_1, \dots, w_k) = S_k - I_k$. If $H, G \in \mathcal{M}_k$ are such that $H \circ g(w_1, \dots, w_k) = G \circ g(w_{\pi(1)}, \dots, w_{\pi(k)})$, for some permutation π of k elements and every choice of $w_1, \dots, w_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\mathcal{C}(H) = \mathcal{C}(G)$.

Moreover, there exists a constant $\xi(k) > 2k$ that depends only on the value of k , such that whenever $\|S_k - I_k\| < 1/(p\xi(k))$, the remainder term Δ satisfies $|\Delta| \leq p^{k+1} M^{2(k+2)} e^{\frac{k}{2} M^2} \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1} C_\Delta(k)$, where $C_\Delta(k)$ is a constant that depends only on k .

Note that Proposition 3.3 applies whenever M , k , d , and p are either as in (3.2) or as in (3.3). The proposition suggests to replace the density ratio $\frac{\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k)}{\phi(w_1) \dots \phi(w_k)}$ by the polynomial $\psi_x(S_k - I_k)$. For a fixed even integer k , we therefore consider, as approximations to the expressions in (3.13), the quantities

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m Z'_{j_{i-1}+1} Z_{j_{i-1}+2} \dots Z'_{j_{i-1}} Z_{j_i} \right) \psi_x(S_l - I_l) \right] - \|x\|^{2(j_m-m)} \quad (3.15)$$

for $l = 1, \dots, k$, for each $m \geq 0$, and for each set of indices $j_0, \dots, j_m$ that satisfies $j_0 = 0$, $j_m \leq l$ and $j_{i-1} + 1 < j_i$ whenever $1 \leq i \leq m$. And as approximation to (3.14), we consider

$$\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[(Z'_1 Z_2 \dots Z_j Z'_j Z_1 - d + p - 1) \psi_x(S_k - I_k) \right] - (1 - \|x\|^2)^k. \quad (3.16)$$

In order for these approximations to be useful we have to make sure that the difference between (3.14) and (3.16) as well as the difference between (3.13) and (3.15) can be controlled. The following proposition provides us with the appropriate tool.

Proposition 3.4. *Fix positive integers d and k . Moreover, let $M > 1$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $d > \max\{4(k+p+1)M^4, 2k + p(2k+2)2^{k+3}, p^2\}$. Let Z be a random d -vector such that $\mathbb{E}Z = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}ZZ' = I_d$, and such that bounds (b1).(a) and (b2) obtain with k as chosen here. Write $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$ for i.i.d. copies of Z . Finally, fix $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let $S_l = (Z'_i Z_j / d)_{i,j=1}^l$, and let $H(S_l - I_l)$ be a (fixed) monomial in the elements of $S_l - I_l$ whose degree, denoted by $\deg(H)$, satisfies $0 \leq \deg(H) \leq l$. Then*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}} \mathbb{E} \left[d^{\frac{l+\deg(H)}{2}} |H(S_l - I_l)| \left| \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_l)}{\phi(Z_1) \dots \phi(Z_l)} - \psi_x(S_l - I_l) \right| \right]$$

is bounded by

$$p^{2k+1+\varepsilon} M^{2(k+2)} e^{\frac{k}{2}M^2} (2D\sqrt{\pi}e)^{pk} \alpha d^{-\varepsilon/2-1/4}$$

times a constant that depends only on k . Here $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/2]$ and $\alpha \geq 1$ are the constants from (b1).(a) and D is the constant from (b2).

This proposition applies under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1(i) and for constants as in (3.2), and also under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1(ii) and for constants as in (3.3). Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.4, consider first the difference of (3.14) and (3.16). This difference is a sum of k terms (with k an even integer), where the modulus of the j -th term is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| Z_1' Z_2 \cdots Z_j Z_j' Z_1 - d + p - 1 \right| \left| \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} - \psi_x(S_k - I_k) \right| \right] \\ & \leq \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[d^{\frac{k+j}{2}} |H_j(S_k - I_k)| \left| \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} - \psi_x(S_k - I_k) \right| \right] \\ & \quad + \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[d^{\frac{k+0}{2}} |H_0(S_k - I_k)| \left| \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_k)} - \psi_x(S_k - I_k) \right| \right], \end{aligned}$$

with $H_0(S_k - I_k) = 1$, $H_1(S_k - I_k) = Z_1' Z_1 / d - 1$ and, for $j \geq 2$, $H_j(S_k - I_k) = d^{-j} Z_1' Z_2 \cdots Z_j Z_j' Z_1$, with $\deg(H_j) = j$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$, and where we have used $|p - 1| \leq |-d + p - 1| \leq d^{k/2}$. Thus Proposition 3.4 yields an upper bound for the supremum over $\mathcal{S}_{M,p}$ of the absolute value of this difference. Taken together, the difference of (3.14) and (3.16) can be bounded, in absolute value and uniformly over $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, by the upper bound from Proposition 3.4 multiplied by $2 \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} = 2(2^k - 1)$ (which is a constant that depends only on k). In the same way one sees that also the absolute difference between (3.13) and (3.15) can be bounded, uniformly over $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, by the quantity given by Proposition 3.4. Note that the bound in Proposition 3.4 is itself upper bounded by (3.1), e.g., by choosing $\kappa = \kappa(k, \alpha)$ and $g = k/2 + 2(k+2)$.

The arguments in this subsection entail that it suffices to bound the approximating quantities (3.15) and (3.16): Theorem 2.1(i) follows if, under the assumptions of that theorem, the expressions of the form (3.15) are all bounded by (3.1), in absolute value, uniformly over $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and for constants as in (3.2). Similarly, Theorem 2.1(ii) follows if, under the assumptions of that theorem, the expressions of the form (3.15) and also (3.16) are all bounded by (3.1), in absolute value, uniformly over $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and for constants as in (3.3).

3.6. Comparing the approximating quantities with Gaussian expressions

We now compare (3.15) and (3.16) with the analogous expressions where the $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$ are replaced by i.i.d. standard normal d -vectors $V_1, \dots, V_k$ (and the

Gram matrices $S_l = (Z_i' Z_j / d)_{i,j=1}^l$ for $l = 1, \dots, k$ are replaced by the corresponding Gram matrices of the V_i 's, i.e., by $S_l^* = (V_i' V_j / d)_{i,j=1}^l$. In particular, we show that (3.15), with the Z_i 's replaced by the V_i 's, can be controlled as desired, and we then show that the difference of (3.15) and of (3.16), with the Z_i 's replaced by the V_i 's, can also be controlled. This will lead to the desired bound on (3.15). A similar strategy is also employed to bound (3.16).

The first step is to bound (3.15) and (3.16) with the Z_i 's replaced by the V_i 's in both displays. More explicitly, for an even integer k , we want to bound the quantities

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m V_{j_{i-1}+1}' V_{j_{i-1}+2} \cdots V_{j_{i-1}}' V_{j_i} \right) \psi_x(S_l^* - I_l) \right] - \|x\|^{2(j_m-m)}, \quad (3.17)$$

for $l = 1, \dots, k$, for each $m \geq 0$, and for each set of indices $j_0, \dots, j_m$ that satisfies $j_0 = 0$, $j_m \leq l$ and $j_{i-1} + 1 < j_i$ whenever $1 \leq i \leq m$. And we also want to bound

$$\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[(V_1' V_2 \cdots V_j V_j' V_1 - d + p - 1) \psi_x(S_k^* - I_k) \right] - (1 - \|x\|^2)^k. \quad (3.18)$$

Note that these expressions can be viewed as approximations, in the sense of Proposition 3.3, to the expressions in the two preceding displays with $\psi_x(S_l^* - I_l)$ and $\psi_x(S_k^* - I_k)$ replaced by $\varphi_x(V_1, \dots, V_l) / (\phi(V_1) \cdots \phi(V_l))$ and $\varphi_x(V_1, \dots, V_k) / (\phi(V_1) \cdots \phi(V_k))$, respectively. But with that replacement, the resulting expressions are equal to zero, as is easily verified (cf. Lemma E.1 for details). It is now elementary to verify, for a standard Gaussian d -vector V , that the bound (b1) with V replacing Z is satisfied with $\varepsilon = 1/2$ (and therefore for all $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/2]$), with $\xi = 1/2$ (and thus for all $\xi \in (0, 1/2]$), and with α and β replaced by constants α^* and β^* that depend only on k (see also the proof of Example A.1(i) in Leeb (2013b)). Clearly also the bound (b2) holds with V replacing Z (e.g. with $D = 1$). Therefore, all the arguments so far concerning the d -vectors $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$ also apply to the Gaussian d -vectors $V_1, \dots, V_k$. In particular, we see that (3.17) and (3.18) are bounded in absolute value by the quantity given in Proposition 3.4, and hence also by (3.1), uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$ and with constants that depend only on k .

It remains to bound the difference of (3.15) and (3.17) as well as the difference of (3.16) and (3.18). In particular, to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1(i), we need to show, under the assumptions of that theorem, that the absolute difference of each expression of the form (3.15) and the corresponding expression in (3.17) is bounded by (3.1), uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$ and for constants as in (3.2). And to finish proving Theorem 2.1(ii), we have to show, under the assumptions of that theorem, that the absolute difference of each expression of the form (3.15) and the corresponding expression in (3.17) and also the absolute difference of (3.16) and (3.18) are all bounded by (3.1), uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$ and for constants as in (3.3).

Proposition 3.5. Suppose the random d -vector Z satisfies the bounds (b1).(a) and (b1).(b) for a fixed positive integer $k \leq 4$. For each $d \geq 1$, let $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$ be i.i.d. copies of Z , set $S_k = (Z'_i Z_j / d)_{i,j=1}^k$, and let G and H be two (fixed) monomials in the elements of $S_k - I_k$ of degree g and h , respectively, where $\max\{g, h\} \leq k$. Finally, define G^* and H^* as G and H , but with the $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$ replaced by i.i.d. standard Gaussian d -vectors, and consider

$$\mathbb{E} \left[d^g \left(G - \mathbb{E}[G] \right) H \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[d^g \left(G^* - \mathbb{E}[G^*] \right) H^* \right]. \quad (3.19)$$

- (i) We then have $|\mathbb{E}[H] - \mathbb{E}[H^*]| \leq d^{-h/2}(\alpha + \alpha^*)$.
(ii) Assume that G is given by the monomial

$$\prod_{i=1}^m (S_k - I_k)_{j_{i-1}+1, j_{i-1}+2} (S_k - I_k)_{j_{i-1}+2, j_{i-1}+3} \cdots (S_k - I_k)_{j_i-1, j_i}, \quad (3.20)$$

for some $m \geq 0$ and for indices $j_0, \dots, j_m$ that satisfy $j_0 = 0$, $j_m \leq k$ and $j_{i-1} + 1 < j_i$ whenever $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then the expression in (3.19) is bounded in absolute value by $d^{-\min\{\xi, 1/2\}} \max\{\alpha + \alpha^*, \beta + \beta^*\}$.

- (iii) Assume that G is given by the monomial

$$(S_k - I_k)_{1,2} (S_k - I_k)_{2,3} \cdots (S_k - I_k)_{j-1,j} (S_k - I_k)_{j,1} \quad (3.21)$$

and note that the degree of G is j and satisfies $1 \leq j \leq k$. Moreover, assume that also the bound (b1).(c) is satisfied with k as chosen here. Then the expression in (3.19) is bounded in absolute value by $d^{-\min\{\xi, 1/2\}} (\beta(\alpha + 1) + \beta^*(\alpha^* + 1) + \beta^2 + \beta^{*2})$, unless either (a) $H = (S_k - I_k)_{a,a}$ for some a satisfying $1 \leq a \leq j$, (b) $H = (S_k - I_k)_{a,b}$ with $1 \leq a < b \leq j$, or (c) $H = ((S_k - I_k)_{a,b})^2$ with $1 \leq a < b \leq j$. In case (a), the expression in (3.19) is equal to $\text{Var}[Z'_1 Z_1]/d - 2$; in case (b), it is equal to $\mathbb{E}[(Z'_1 Z_2)^3]/d$; and in case (c), it equals $\text{Var}[(Z'_1 Z_2)^2]/d^2 - 2(1 + 3/d)$.

Here, α , β and ξ are the constants from (b1) and α^* and β^* are the analogous quantities to α and β if Z is replaced by a standard Gaussian d -vector. Note that α^* and β^* can be chosen such that they depend only on the value of k .

For later use, we note that Proposition 3.5(i)–(ii) applies under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1(i), and that Proposition 3.5(i)–(iii) applies under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1(ii).

Assume for the moment that Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.5(i)–(ii) applies, and consider the difference between (3.15) and (3.17), for some integer $k \leq 4$, and for indices $l, m, j_0, \dots, j_m$ such that $1 \leq l \leq k$, $m \geq 0$, $j_0 = 0$, $j_m \leq l$ and $j_{i-1} + 1 < j_i$ whenever $1 \leq i \leq m$. If $m = 0$, the difference of interest is simply

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi_x(S_l - I_l)] - \mathbb{E}[\psi_x(S_l^* - I_l)]. \quad (3.22)$$

For $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, recall that $\psi_x(S_l - I_l)$ is a weighted sum of monomials in $S_k - I_k$ of degree up to k , where the weights are all bounded in absolute value by $p^k M^{2(k+2)} C_\psi(k)$, where $C_\psi(k)$ is a constant that depends only on k (use Proposition 3.3 with l replacing k , and note that $l \leq k$). In that sum, the number of summands depends only on k . Therefore, (3.22) is a weighted sum of terms of the form $\mathbb{E}[H] - \mathbb{E}[H^*]$ as in Proposition 3.5(i) and thus we see that (3.22) is bounded by $p^k M^{2(k+2)} d^{-1/2} \kappa$ in absolute value and uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, where κ depends only on α and k . [Note that for $\deg(H) = 0$ the difference in question is equal to zero.] This, in turn, is obviously bounded by the quantity in (3.1) uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, for an appropriate choice of g , e.g., $g = 2(k+2)$, that depends only on k and for $\kappa = \kappa(k, \alpha)$ depending only on k and α . If $m > 0$, the difference of interest reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m Z'_{j_{i-1}+1} Z_{j_{i-1}+2} \cdots Z'_{j_i-1} Z_{j_i} \right) \psi_x(S_l - I_l) \right] \\ & - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m V'_{j_{i-1}+1} V_{j_{i-1}+2} \cdots V'_{j_i-1} V_{j_i} \right) \psi_x(S_l^* - I_l) \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[d^{\deg(G)} (G - \mathbb{E}[G]) \psi_x(S_l - I_l) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[d^{\deg(G^*)} (G^* - \mathbb{E}[G^*]) \psi_x(S_l^* - I_l) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where G and G^* are as in Proposition 3.5(ii) and thus have mean zero. Again, if $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, then we are dealing with a weighted sum of expressions of the form (3.19) whose weights are all bounded in absolute value by $p^k M^{2(k+2)} C_\psi(k)$ (by Proposition 3.3). Arguing as in the case where $m = 0$ and now using Proposition 3.5(ii), we see that the expression in the preceding display is bounded by (3.1) in absolute value and uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$ for a constant $g = g(k)$ depending only on k and for $\kappa = \kappa(k, \alpha, \beta)$ depending only on k , α , and β .

Now suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 2.1(i) are satisfied. The argument in the preceding paragraph with $k = 2$ shows that the absolute difference between (3.15) and (3.17) is bounded by (3.1) uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$ and for constants as in (3.2) (because k is fixed and equals 2 here). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1(i).

Finally, assume that the conditions of Theorem 2.1(ii) are met (and note that hence $k = 4$). Arguing as in the second-to-last paragraph, we see that the absolute difference between (3.15) and (3.17) is bounded by (3.1) uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$ and for constants as in (3.3) (again because k is fixed here). It remains to deal with the difference of (3.16) and (3.18). It is not difficult to re-write this

difference as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[(Z'_1 Z_2 \cdots Z_j Z'_j Z_1 - d + p - 1) \psi_x(S_k - I_k) \right] \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[(V'_1 V_2 \cdots V_j V'_j V_1 - d + p - 1) \psi_x(S_k^* - I_k) \right] \right\} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[d^{\deg(G_j)} (G_j - \mathbb{E}[G_j]) \psi_x(S_k - I_k) \right] \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[d^{\deg(G_j^*)} (G_j^* - \mathbb{E}[G_j^*]) \psi_x(S_k^* - I_k) \right] \right\} \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} (p-1) \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\psi_x(S_k - I_k) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\psi_x(S_k^* - I_k) \right] \right\}, \tag{3.23}
\end{aligned}$$

where G_j is shorthand for $Z'_1 Z_1 / d - 1$ if $j = 1$ and for $Z'_1 Z_2 \cdots Z_j Z'_j Z_1 / d^j$ if $j > 1$, and where G_j^* denotes the corresponding quantity computed from the V_i 's. Clearly, $\mathbb{E}[G_1] = 0$, while, for $j > 1$, $\mathbb{E}[G_j] = d^{-j+1}$, which verifies the equality in the previous display. Now the expected value in the last line of the preceding display can be treated similarly to (3.22) with $l = k$. Noting that $(p-1) \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} = (p-1)$, we see that the expression in the last line of the preceding display is bounded, in absolute value and uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, by (3.1) for constants as in (3.3). We are left with the sum in (3.23). Recalling that $\psi_x(S_k - I_k)$ and $\psi_x(S_k^* - I_k)$ are both weighted sums of monomials, we can re-write (3.23) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \sum_{H \in \mathcal{M}_k} \mathcal{C}(H) \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[d^{\deg(G_j)} (G_j - \mathbb{E}[G_j]) H \right] \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[d^{\deg(G_j^*)} (G_j^* - \mathbb{E}[G_j^*]) H^* \right] \right\}, \tag{3.24}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_k$ and $\mathcal{C}(H)$, $H \in \mathcal{M}_k$, are as in Proposition 3.3, and where H^* is defined as H but with the Z_i 's replaced by the V_i 's. Note that (3.24) is a weighted sum of expressions of the form (3.19), where G_j and G_j^* are given by (3.21) defined with the Z_i 's and the V_i 's respectively. The coefficients $\mathcal{C}(H)$ of the terms in the polynomial $\varphi_x(S_k - I_k)$, as defined in Proposition 3.3, can be bounded, in absolute value and uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, by $p^k M^{2(k+2)} C_\psi(k)$. And using Proposition 3.5(iii), the difference of expectations in (3.24) can be bounded by $d^{-\min\{\xi, 1/2\}} (\beta(\alpha+1) + \beta^*(\alpha^*+1) + \beta^2 + \beta^{*2})$, unless the case (a), (b), or (c) in Proposition 3.5(iii) occurs. Taken together, it is now elementary to verify that those terms in (3.24) that do not correspond to the cases (a), (b), or (c) in the proposition are bounded, in absolute value and uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, by an expression of the form (3.1) with constants as in (3.3).

To deal with the remaining terms in (3.24), consider first those terms where G_j and H are as in case (a) of Proposition 3.5(iii). For each of these terms, the monomial H is of the form $(S_k - I_k)_{a,a}$ for some a with $1 \leq a \leq j$. Because the coefficients $\mathcal{C}(H)$ are invariant under permutations in the sense of Proposition 3.3, we see that the coefficient $\mathcal{C}(H)$ is the same number whenever case (a) occurs, and we denote this number by $\mathcal{C}_{(a)}$ in the following. Moreover, whenever G_j and H are such that the case (a) occurs, then the difference in expectations in (3.24) is equal to the same number, namely $\text{Var}[Z'_1 Z_1]/d - 2$, by Proposition 3.5(iii). Finally, for fixed j (and hence for fixed G_j), we note that the number of monomials H , where G_j and H are as in case (a), is equal to j . Putting the pieces together, we see that the combined contribution of those terms in (3.24), where G_j and H are as in case (a) of Proposition 3.5(iii), is equal to

$$\mathcal{C}_{(a)} (\text{Var}[Z'_1 Z_1]/d - 2) \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} (-1)^{k-j} j.$$

But the sum in the preceding display can be written as $k \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{j} (-1)^{k-1-j} = k(1-1)^{k-1} = 0$ (recall that we have chosen $k = 4$ here). Hence, the combined contribution of these terms is zero.

Consider now those terms in (3.24) where G_j and H are as in case (b) of Proposition 3.5(iii). For each of these terms, the monomial H is of the form $(S_k - I_k)_{a,b}$ for some a and b with $1 \leq a < b \leq j$. As in the preceding paragraph, we see that the coefficient $\mathcal{C}(H)$ is the same number whenever case (b) occurs, and we denote this number by $\mathcal{C}_{(b)}$; cf. Proposition 3.3. And whenever G_j and H are such that the case (b) occurs, then the difference in expectations in (3.24) is equal to the same number, namely $\mathbb{E}[(Z'_1 Z_1)^3]/d$; cf. Proposition 3.5(iii). Finally, for fixed j (and hence for fixed G_j), there are $\binom{j}{2}$ monomials H so that G_j and H are as in case (b). The contribution of those terms in (3.24), where G_j and H are as in case (b) of Proposition 3.5(iii), is therefore equal to

$$\mathcal{C}_{(b)} \mathbb{E}[(Z'_1 Z_1)^3/d] \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} (-1)^{k-j} \binom{j}{2}.$$

The sum in the preceding display can be written as $\binom{k}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \binom{k-2}{j} (-1)^{k-2-j} = 0$. A similar argument shows that the combined contribution of the terms where case (c) occurs is also zero.

In summary, we see, under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1(ii), that the difference of (3.15) and (3.17) as well as the difference of (3.16) and (3.18) can be bounded by (3.1) in absolute value, uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$, and for constants as in (3.3). With this, also the proof of Theorem 2.1(ii) is complete.

Appendix A: Proofs for Section 3.1

Lemma A.1. *For Z , d and p as in Section 3.1, there are measurable functions $\mu : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{V}_{d,p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\Delta : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{V}_{d,p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $h : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{V}_{d,p} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\mu(x, B) = \mathbb{E}[Z \| B'Z = x]$, $\Delta(x, B) = \mathbb{E}[ZZ' \| B'Z = x] - (I_d + B(xx' - I_p)B')$ and $h(x, B) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})}\right]$, respectively, where $W^{x|B} = Bx + (I_d - BB')V$ and ϕ denotes a Lebesgue density of $V \sim N(0, I_d)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{B}$ be uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ and let z_j denote the j -th component of Z , $j = 1, \dots, d$. Clearly, $\mathbb{E}[z_j \| \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'Z] = m_j(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'Z)$ for some measurable function $m_j : \mathcal{V}_{d,p} \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Now Lemma B.1 in Leeb (2013b) entails that for $B \in \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$, the function m_j satisfies $m_j(B, B'Z) = \mathbb{E}[z_j \| B'Z]$ (a.s.). In other words, for every $B \in \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$, $m_j(B, x)$ satisfies the definition of a conditional expectation of z_j given $B'Z = x$. Setting $\mu_{x|B} = (m_1(B, x), \dots, m_d(B, x))'$ finishes the first part.

For existence of Δ it suffices to show existence of a measurable function $D : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{V}_{d,p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $D(x, B) = \mathbb{E}[ZZ' \| B'Z = x]$, since $(I_d + B(xx' - I_p)B')$ is continuous from $\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. To do this, argue as in the preceding paragraph but with z_j replaced by $z_i z_j$ for $(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^2$.

The quantity $\mathbb{E}[f(W^{x|B})/\phi(W^{x|B})]$, as a function of x and B , is uniquely defined and measurable in view of Tonelli's theorem since $g(x, B, v) = Bx + (I_d - BB')v$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{V}_{d,p} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and hence, measurable. $\square$

Lemma A.2. (i) *Suppose (3.2) is bounded by (3.1), for $k = 2$ and for every $M > 1$ and all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d > \max\{4(k+p+1)M^4, 2k+p(2k+2)2^{k+3}, p^2\}$, where $\kappa = \kappa_1 \geq 1$ depends only on α and β , and where $g = g_1$. Then the conclusion of Theorem 2.1(i) holds with $\gamma_1 = \max\{g_1, 6 + 2\log(2D\sqrt{\pi e})\}$.*

(ii) *Suppose (3.2) and (3.3) are both bounded by (3.1), for $k = 4$ and for every $M > 1$ and all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d > \max\{4(k+p+1)M^4, 2k+p(2k+2)2^{k+3}, p^2\}$, where $\kappa = \kappa_2 \geq 1$ depends only on α and β , and where $g = g_2$. Then the conclusion of Theorem 2.1(ii) holds with $\gamma_2 = \max\{g_2, 10 + 4\log(2D\sqrt{\pi e})\}$.*

Proof. For part (i), let $k = 2$, $p < d$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$, and $\xi_1 = \min\{\xi, \varepsilon/2 + 1/4, 1/2\}/3$, as in Theorem 2.1(i). We first note that (3.1) can be re-written and further bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} & p^{2k+1+\varepsilon} e^{gM^2} (2D\sqrt{\pi e})^{pk} d^{-\min\{\xi, \varepsilon/2+1/4, 1/2\} \kappa} \\ &= p^{(5+\varepsilon)} e^{g_1 M^2} (2D\sqrt{\pi e})^{2p} d^{-3\xi_1 \kappa_1} \\ &\leq e^{g_1 M^2 + p[6+2\log(2D\sqrt{\pi e})]} d^{-3\xi_1 \kappa_1} \leq e^{\gamma_1 M^2 + \gamma_1 p} d^{-3\xi_1 \kappa_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We introduce the parameters $\tau_1 > 0$ and $\tau_2 > 0$ to fine-tune our bounds. Let $M_d = \sqrt{\tau_1 \log d / \gamma_1}$ and $\delta_d = d^{-\tau_2}$. Define the set G as $G = \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ in case $M_d \leq 1$,

and as

$$G = \left\{ B \in \mathcal{V}_{d,p} : \int_{\|x\| \leq M_d} \|\mathbb{E}[Z \| B'Z = x] - Bx\|^2 h(x|B)^2 \phi_p(x) dx \leq \delta_d \right\}$$

in case $M_d > 1$, where dx denotes integration with respect to Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^p$ and ϕ_p denotes a Lebesgue density of the standard normal distribution on $\mathbb{R}^p$. Note that G depends on the distribution of Z (through $h(x|B)$ and through the conditional expectation), and also on τ_1 and τ_2 , in case $M_d > 1$. In either case, G is a Borel subset of $\mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ (in view of Lemma A.1 and Tonelli's theorem). For any $t > 0$ and $B \in G$, we can bound the probability in (1.1) as follows: In case $M_d > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbb{E}[Z \| B'Z] - BB'Z\| > t) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbb{E}[Z \| B'Z] - BB'Z\| > t, \|B'Z\| \leq M_d) + \mathbb{P}(\|B'Z\| > M_d) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \int_{\|x\| \leq M_d} \|\mathbb{E}[Z \| B'Z = x] - Bx\| d\mathbb{P}_{B'Z}(x) + \mathbb{P}(\|B'Z\|^2 > M_d^2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \int_{\|x\| \leq M_d} \|\mathbb{E}[Z \| B'Z = x] - Bx\| h(x|B) \phi_p(x) dx + \frac{1}{M_d^2} \mathbb{E}[\text{trace } BB'ZZ'] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \left(\int_{\|x\| \leq M_d} \|\mathbb{E}[Z \| B'Z = x] - Bx\|^2 h(x|B)^2 \phi_p(x) dx \right)^{1/2} + \frac{p}{M_d^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\delta_d^{1/2}}{t} + \frac{p}{M_d^2} = \frac{1}{d^{\tau_2/2}t} + \frac{\gamma_1}{\tau_1} \frac{p}{\log d}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where the second-to-last inequality follows, for example, from Jensen's inequality for concave functions, and we have used that $x \mapsto h(x|B)\phi_p(x)$ is a Lebesgue density of $B'Z$ (cf. Proposition 3.1). And in the case where $M_d \leq 1$, the probability in (1.1) is also bounded by (A.2), because that upper bound is larger than one in this case. Finally, the probability of the complement of G can be re-written and bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{d,p}(G^c) &= \nu_{d,p} \left(\int_{\|x\| \leq M_d} \|\mathbb{E}[Z \| B'Z = x] - Bx\|^2 h(x|B)^2 \phi_p(x) dx > \delta_d \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\delta_d} \int \int_{\|x\| \leq M_d} [\|\mu_{x|B}\|^2 - \|x\|^2] h(x|B)^2 \phi_p(x) dx d\nu_{d,p}(B) \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta_d} \int \int_{\|x\| \leq M_d} [\|\mu_{x|B}\|^2 - \|x\|^2] h(x|B)^2 d\nu_{d,p}(B) \phi_p(x) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\delta_d} \sup_{\|x\| \leq M_d} \int [\|\mu_{x|B}\|^2 - \|x\|^2] h(x|B)^2 d\nu_{d,p}(B), \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

where we have used Markov's inequality and Tonelli's theorem.

Consider first the case where $M_d > 1$ and where $d > \max\{4(k+p+1)M_d^4, 2k+p(2k+2)2^{k+3}, p^2\}$. In that case, (3.2) is bounded by (3.1) with M_d replacing M by assumption, and hence also the supremum in (A.3) is bounded by (A.1) with M_d replacing M . This entails that

$$\nu_{d,p}(G^c) \leq \frac{1}{\delta_d} e^{\gamma_1 M_d^2 + p\gamma_1} d^{-3\xi_1} \kappa_1 = \kappa_1 d^{-3\xi_1 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \gamma_1 p / \log d}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Now we see that there is a trade-off between the bound in (A.4) and the one in (A.2) in the sense that one can be made smaller at the expense of the other. We here choose the tuning parameters τ_1 and τ_2 such that both bounds are of the same leading order in d , i.e., we choose τ_1 so that $\tau_1 + \tau_2 - 3\xi_1 = -\tau_2/2$. And with the constant τ chosen earlier, we choose τ_2 so that $\tau_2/2 = \tau\xi_1$. With this choice of τ_1 and τ_2 , it is now elementary to verify that the bounds (A.4) and (A.2) are of the form claimed by Theorem 2.1(i).

Consider next the case where $M_d \leq 1$. In that case, we have $G = \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ by construction, so that $\nu_{d,p}(G^c)$ equals zero and hence is trivially bounded as claimed. Moreover, we have also seen that the probability in (1.1) is here trivially bounded by the expression in (A.2) and hence also by the bound given in Theorem 2.1(i) upon choosing τ_1 and τ_2 as in the preceding paragraph.

Finally, consider the case where $M_d > 1$ and where $d \leq \max\{4(k+p+1)M_d^4, 2k+p(2k+2)2^{k+3}, p^2\}$. With the constants τ_1 and τ_2 as chosen before, the upper bound in (A.2) is again as claimed in Theorem 2.1(i). It remains to show that the upper bound in (A.4) is trivial, i.e., not less than one, here. The expression in (A.4) can be written as $\kappa_1 d^{-\tau\xi_1 + \gamma_1 p / \log d}$ upon noting that $\tau_1 + \tau_2 - 3\xi_1 = -\tau\xi_1$. It is now easy to see that (A.4) is not less than one if

$$\log d \leq 6\gamma_1 p, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

upon noting that $\kappa_1 \geq 1$, that $\tau < 1$, and that $\xi_1 \leq 1/6$. If $d \leq p^2$, we have $\log d \leq 2p$, and the relation in (A.5) holds because $2p \leq 36p \leq 6\gamma_1 p$ by our choice of γ_1 . If $d \leq 2k + p(2k+2)2^{k+3}$, or, equivalently, if $d \leq 4 + 192p$ (recall that $k = 2$), then we have $\log d \leq \log(192p) \leq 36p$ (where the last inequality is elementary to verify). In particular, we see that (A.5) holds also in this case. Lastly, consider the case where $d \leq 4(k+p+1)M_d^4$. Using the definitions of M_d and τ_1 , together with the facts that $\tau \in (0, 1)$, that $\xi_1 \leq 1/6$, and that $\gamma_1 \geq 6$, we see that $d/(\log d)^2 \leq (p+3)/36 \leq p/9$ or, equivalently, that $324d/(\log d)^2 \leq 36p$. It is now elementary to verify that $\log d \leq 324d/(\log d)^2$, such that, again, the relation (A.5) is satisfied. This completes the proof of part (i).

The derivation of part (ii) is similar: Set $k = 4$, $p < d$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$, and $\xi_2 = \min\{\xi, \varepsilon/2 + 1/4, 1/2\}/5$. Note that (3.1) can here be written and bounded as

$$p^{2k+1+\varepsilon} e^{gM^2} (2D\sqrt{\pi e})^{pk} d^{-\min\{\xi, \varepsilon/2 + 1/4, 1/2\}} \kappa \leq e^{\gamma_2 M^2 + \gamma_2 p} d^{-5\xi_2} \kappa_2 \quad (\text{A.6})$$

by arguing as in (A.1). For tuning-parameters $\tau_1 > 0$ and $\tau_2 > 0$, set $M_d = \sqrt{\tau_1 \log d / \gamma_2}$ and $\delta_d = d^{-\tau_2}$.

For bounding (1.1), we argue as in the proof of part (i) to obtain a Borel set G_1 so that (1.1) with G_1 replacing G is bounded as claimed in Theorem 2.1(ii), and so that $\nu_{d,p}(G_1^c)$ is bounded by half the upper bound given in Theorem 2.1(ii) (i.e., with κ_2 replacing $2\kappa_2$).

If we can also find a Borel set G_2 so that (1.2) with G_2 replacing G is bounded as claimed, and so that $\nu_{d,p}(G_2^c)$ is bounded by half the bound given in the theorem, then the proof is completed by setting $G = G_1 \cap G_2$. To this end, set $G_2 = \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ if $M_d \leq 1$, and set

$$G_2 = \left\{ B \in \mathcal{V}_{d,p} : \int_{\|x\| \leq M_d} \|\Delta_{x|B}\|^4 h(x|B)^4 \phi_p(x) dx \leq \delta_d \right\}$$

otherwise. For fixed $g > 0$ and $B \in G_2$, the probability in (1.2) can be bounded as follows: In case $M_d > 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_{B'Z|B}\| > t) \leq \frac{\delta_d^{1/4}}{t} + \frac{p}{M_d^2} = \frac{1}{d^{\tau_2/4}t} + \frac{\gamma_2}{\tau_1} \frac{p}{\log d}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

by arguing as in (A.2). And in case $M_d \leq 1$, the probability in (1.2) is trivially bounded as in (A.7), because the upper bound is larger than one. Finally, for $\nu_{d,p}(G_2^c)$, we have

$$\nu_{d,p}(G_2^c) \leq \frac{1}{\delta_d} \sup_{\|x\| \leq M_d} \int \text{trace } \Delta_{x|B}^4 h(x|B)^4 d\nu_{d,p}(B), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

by arguing as in (A.3) and upon noting that $\|\Delta_{x|B}\|^4 \leq \text{trace } \Delta_{x|B}^4$.

In the case where $M_d > 1$ and where $d > \max\{4(k+p+1)M_d^4, 2k+p(2k+2)2^{k+3}, p^2\}$, we see that

$$\nu_{d,p}(G_2^c) \leq \frac{1}{\delta_d} e^{\gamma_2 M_d^2 + \gamma_2 p} d^{-5\xi_2} \kappa_2 = \kappa_2 d^{-5\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \gamma_2 p / \log d} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

upon using (A.8), the assumption of the lemma, and (A.6). We balance the upper bounds in (A.7) and (A.9) by choosing τ_1 and τ_2 so that $\tau_1 + \tau_2 - 5\xi_2 = -\tau_2/4 = -\tau\xi_2$, resulting in upper bounds as desired. The remaining cases, i.e., the case where $M_d \leq 1$, and the case where $M_d > 1$ and $d \leq \max\{4(k+p+1)M_d^4, 2k+p(2k+2)2^{k+3}, p^2\}$, are treated as in the proof of part (i), mutatis mutandis. $\square$

Appendix B: Proofs for Section 3.2

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Define $T : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ by $T(v) = B'v$, write λ_d for the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and write $\mathbb{P}_Z$, $\mathbb{P}_{T(Z)}$, etc. and $\mathbb{E}_Z$, $\mathbb{E}_{T(Z)}$, etc.

for the push-forward measures and the corresponding expectation operators, respectively, induced by the indicated random variables. With this, $\mathbb{P}_{T(V)}$ is the $N(0, I_p)$ -distribution, and $\mathbb{P}_{W^{x|B}}$ is the $N(Bx, I_d - B'B)$ -distribution and also a regular conditional distribution of V given $B'V = x$, i.e., $\mathbb{P}_{W^{x|B}} = \mathbb{P}_{V||B'V=x}$ (cf. [Hoffmann-Jørgensen \(1994b\)](#), Relation 10.7.6)).

For the first statement, we have $\mathbb{P}_Z \ll \lambda_d$ with $\frac{d\mathbb{P}_Z}{d\lambda_d} = f$, and hence also $\mathbb{P}_Z \ll \mathbb{P}_V$ with $\frac{d\mathbb{P}_Z}{d\mathbb{P}_V} = \frac{f}{\phi}$. It follows that $\mathbb{P}_{T(Z)} \ll \mathbb{P}_{T(V)}$, and that

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{T(Z)}}{d\mathbb{P}_{T(V)}}(x) = \mathbb{E}_V \left[\frac{f}{\phi} \middle| T = x \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{f}{\phi}(V) \middle| B'V = x \right] \quad \lambda_p\text{-a.e.}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where the first equality is obtained from, say, [Hoffmann-Jørgensen \(1994b\)](#), Relation 10.11.1), and where the second equality holds because one easily verifies that the left-hand-side satisfies the definition of the conditional expectation on the right-hand-side. On the far left-hand-side of (B.1), we already have a density $h(x|B)$ of $B'Z$ with respect to the p -variate standard Gaussian measure. The expression on the far right-hand side of (B.1) can be written as $\int f(v)/\phi(v) d\mathbb{P}_{V||B'V=x}(v) = \int f(v)/\phi(v) d\mathbb{P}_{W^{x|B}}(v) = \mathbb{E}[f(W^{x|B})/\phi(W^{x|B})]$ λ_p -a.e., as desired (cf., say, [Hoffmann-Jørgensen \(1994b\)](#), Relation 10.3.5)).

For the second statement fix a version of $h(x|B)$ and set $D = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : 0 < h(x|B) < \infty\}$. For a Borel set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, set

$$\mathbb{P}_{Z||B'Z=x}(F) = \int_F \frac{f}{\phi}(v) d\mathbb{P}_{V||B'V=x}(v) / h(x|B)$$

if $x \in D$, and set $\mathbb{P}_{Z||B'Z=x}(F) = \mathbb{P}_Z(F)$ otherwise. Note that $\mathbb{P}_{Z||B'Z=x}$ is a regular conditional distribution of Z given $B'Z = x$; cf. [Hoffmann-Jørgensen \(1994b\)](#), Relation 10.11.3). Recalling that $\mathbb{P}_{V||B'V=x} = \mathbb{P}_{W^{x|B}}$, this entails that $\mathbb{E}[\Psi(Z)||B'Z = x]$ can be computed as

$$\int \Psi(v) \frac{f}{\phi}(v) d\mathbb{P}_{W^{x|B}}(v) / h(x|B) = \mathbb{E} \left[\Psi(W^{x|B}) \frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})} \right] / h(x|B)$$

whenever $x \in D$. This proves the second statement unless $h(x|B) = 0$. But if $h(x|B) = 0$, then $f/\phi = 0$ $\mathbb{P}_{W^{x|B}}$ -a.e. in view of (B.1), and hence also $\mathbb{E}[\Psi(W^{x|B}) \frac{f(W^{x|B})}{\phi(W^{x|B})}] = 0$. $\square$

Lemma B.1. *The expression in (3.8) can be decomposed as the weighted sum of the expressions in (3.9), provided all expected values that occur are finite. The number of summands in this decomposition depends only on k , and the weight of each summand only depends on k and on $\|x\|^2$, and is a polynomial in $\|x\|^2$.*

Proof. Write Υ as an abbreviation for the product of density ratios in (3.8) and set $X_j = W_j W'_j - I_d$ and $Y = \mathbf{B}(xx' - I_p)\mathbf{B}'$. Then the quantity of interest can

be written as $\mathbb{E}[\text{trace} \prod_{j=1}^k (X_j - Y) \Upsilon]$ or, equivalently, as

$$\sum_{l=1}^k (-1)^{k-l} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_l \leq k} \mathbb{E} [\text{trace } X_{j_1} Y^{j_2-j_1-1} X_{j_2} \dots X_{j_l} Y^{k-j_l+j_1-1} \Upsilon] \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$+ (-1)^k \mathbb{E}[\text{trace } Y^k \Upsilon],$$

where we adopt the convention that $Y^0 = I_d$ and where we have moved a possibly leading Y -term to the end of the product. In this sum, l indicates the number of occurrences of X_j 's in the product.

We first show that (B.2) can be written as the sum of

$$\text{trace} \{ (-1)^k (xx' - I_p)^k \mathbb{E}[\Upsilon] \}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\text{trace} \{ \mathbb{E}[X_1 X_2 \dots X_k \Upsilon] \}, \text{ and} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\text{trace} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{k-l} (xx' - I_p)^{k-l} \right. \\ \left. \times \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_l \leq k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \mathbf{B}' X_{f_i} X_{f_{i+1}} \dots X_{f_{i+1}-1} \mathbf{B} \right) \Upsilon \right] \right\}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where the indices m and $f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}$ in (B.5) depend on the indices $j_1, \dots, j_l$ in (B.5), and they satisfy $m \geq 1$ and $1 = f_1 < f_2 < \dots < f_{m+1} = l+1$. Obviously, (B.3) equals the last term in (B.2), and (B.4) is equal to the summand in (B.2) with $l = k$. Now, for $0 < l < k$ consider the corresponding expected value in (B.2), i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{trace } X_{j_1} Y^{j_2-j_1-1} X_{j_2} \dots X_{j_l} Y^{k-j_l+j_1-1} \Upsilon],$$

for a fixed set of indices $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_l \leq k$. At least one of the exponents of the Y -terms is non-zero (because $l < k$) and there is at least one X_i -factor in the product (because $l > 0$). Hence, the matrix product inside the expectation can be seen as a product of blocks, each consisting of one or more consecutive X_j 's followed by a non-zero power of Y . Since the W_j 's are conditionally i.i.d. given B , we may assume that $X_{j_i} = X_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$. Furthermore, $Y^m = [\mathbf{B}(xx' - I_p)\mathbf{B}']^m = \mathbf{B}(xx' - I_p)^m \mathbf{B}'$ for any integer $m \geq 1$. Therefore, the expression in the preceding display can be written as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\text{trace} \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbf{B}' X_{f_i} X_{f_{i+1}} \dots X_{f_{i+1}-1} \mathbf{B} (xx' - I_p)^{v_i} \Upsilon \right],$$

where m indicates the number of blocks as just described and satisfies $1 \leq m \leq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$, where the f_i 's obey $1 = f_1 < f_2 < \dots < f_{m+1} = l+1$, and where $f_{i+1} - f_i \geq 1$ and $v_i \geq 1$ is the number of X_j 's and the power of Y , respectively, in the i -th block. Set $n_i = f_{i+1} - f_i$. We note that $\sum_{i=1}^m n_i = l$ and

that $\sum_{i=1}^m v_i = k - l$. If the matrices $\mathbf{B}'X_{f_i}X_{f_i+1}\cdots X_{f_{i+1}-1}\mathbf{B}$ and $(xx' - I_p)^{v_i}$ commute, then we can write the matrix product in the preceding display as

$$(xx' - I_p)^{k-l} \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbf{B}'X_{f_i}X_{f_i+1}\cdots X_{f_{i+1}-1}\mathbf{B}.$$

To show that these matrices do commute, we note that $\mathbf{B}'W_j = x$. We can thus write $\mathbf{B}'X_{f_i}X_{f_i+1}\cdots X_{f_{i+1}-1}\mathbf{B}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbf{B}' \left[(-1)^{n_i} I_d + \sum_{g=1}^{n_i} (-1)^{n_i-g} \sum_{f_i \leq u_1 < \dots < u_g \leq f_{i+1}-1} W_{u_1} W'_{u_1} \cdots W_{u_g} W'_{u_g} \right] \mathbf{B} \\ &= (-1)^{n_i} I_p + (-1)^{n_i-1} n_i xx' \\ &\quad + xx' \sum_{g=2}^{n_i} (-1)^{n_i-g} \sum_{f_i \leq u_1 < \dots < u_g \leq f_{i+1}-1} W'_{u_1} W_{u_2} W'_{u_2} \cdots W_{u_{g-1}} W'_{u_{g-1}} W_{u_g}. \end{aligned}$$

The expression in the preceding display can be written as $\sum_{g=0}^{n_i} c_{i,g}$ with $c_{i,0} = (-1)^{n_i} I_p$, $c_{i,1} = (-1)^{n_i-1} n_i xx'$, and with $c_{i,g} = (-1)^{n_i-g} xx' \sum W'_{u_1} \cdots W_{u_g}$ if $g \geq 2$. Note that each of the $c_{i,g}$'s is a scalar multiple of I_p or of the matrix xx' . And note that $(xx' - I_p)$ commutes with xx' . Therefore $(xx' - I_p)^{v_i}$ commutes with all the $c_{i,g}$ and hence with $\mathbf{B}'X_{f_i}X_{f_i+1}\cdots X_{f_{i+1}-1}\mathbf{B}$, as desired. This entails that the expression in (B.2) is indeed given by the sum of (B.3), (B.4), and (B.5).

For the next step, we note that the sum of (B.3), (B.4), and (B.5) can also be written as the sum of

$$\text{trace} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[(X_1 X_2 \cdots X_k - [\mathbf{B}(xx' - I_p)\mathbf{B}']^k) \Upsilon \right] \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{trace} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{k-l} (xx' - I_p)^{k-l} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_l \leq k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \mathbf{B}'X_{f_i}X_{f_i+1}\cdots X_{f_{i+1}-1}\mathbf{B} - (xx' - I_p)^l \right) \Upsilon \right] \right\}, \quad (\text{B.7}) \end{aligned}$$

which is elementary to verify upon writing $(-1)^k (xx' - I_p)^k \Upsilon$ as $-(xx' - I_p)^k \Upsilon \sum_{l=1}^k \binom{k}{l} (-1)^{k-l}$.

We now expand (B.6) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{trace } \mathbb{E} \left[((W_1 W_1' - I_d)(W_2 W_2' - I_d) \cdots (W_k W_k' - I_d) - [\mathbf{B}(xx' - I_p)\mathbf{B}']^k) \Upsilon \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left((-1)^k d + \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} W_1' W_2 \cdots W_j W_j' W_1 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - (-1)^k p - \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \|x\|^{2j} \right) \Upsilon \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left((-1)^k (d - p) + \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} (W_1' W_2 \cdots W_j W_j' W_1 - \|x\|^{2j}) \right) \Upsilon \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} (W_1' W_2 \cdots W_j W_j' W_1 - d + p - \|x\|^{2j}) \right) \Upsilon \right],
\end{aligned}$$

using the exchangeability of the W_i 's in the first equality, and the relation $(-1)^k + \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} (-1)^{k-j} = 0$ in the last one. In particular, we see that (B.6) is equal to the first expression in (3.9).

For (B.7), we first consider each of the expected values in (B.7). Expanding $\mathbf{B}' X_{f_i} X_{f_i+1} \cdots X_{f_{i+1}-1} \mathbf{B}$ and $(xx' - I_p)^l = \prod_{i=1}^m (xx' - I_p)^{n_i}$ similarly as above, each expected value in (B.7) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \mathbf{B}' X_{f_i} X_{f_i+1} \cdots X_{f_{i+1}-1} \mathbf{B} - (xx' - I_p)^l \right) \Upsilon \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \left((-1)^{n_i} I_p + xx' \sum_{g=1}^{n_i} (-1)^{n_i-g} \binom{n_i}{g} W_{f_i}' W_{f_i+1} W_{f_i+1}' \cdots W_{f_i+g-1} \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \prod_{i=1}^m \left((-1)^{n_i} I_p + xx' \sum_{g=1}^{n_i} (-1)^{n_i-g} \binom{n_i}{g} \|x\|^{2(g-1)} \right) \right) \Upsilon \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we adopt the convention that $W_{f_i}' W_{f_i+1} W_{f_i+1}' \cdots W_{f_i+g-1}$ is to be interpreted as 1 in case $g = 1$. Now we write the expression in the preceding display more compactly as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \sum_{g=0}^{n_i} a_{i,g} \gamma_{i,g} - \prod_{i=1}^m \sum_{g=0}^{n_i} a_{i,g} \delta_{i,g} \right) \Upsilon \right],$$

where $a_{i,0} = (-1)^{n_i} I_p$, $\gamma_{i,0} = \delta_{i,0} = 1$, and for $g = 1, \dots, n_i$, $a_{i,g} = xx' \binom{n_i}{g} (-1)^{n_i-g}$, $\gamma_{i,g} = W_{f_i}' W_{f_i+1} W_{f_i+1}' \cdots W_{f_i+g-1}$, $\delta_{i,g} = \|x\|^{2(g-1)}$. Note that we have $\gamma_{i,1} = 1$ by the convention adopted earlier. Note that the $\gamma_{i,g}$'s and the $\delta_{i,g}$'s are scalars and hence commute with the $a_{i,g}$'s. The expression in the preceding display or, equivalently, each expected value in (B.7), can now be

re-written as

$$\sum_{g_1=0}^{n_1} \cdots \sum_{g_m=0}^{n_m} \left(\prod_{i=1}^m a_{i,g_i} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \gamma_{i,g_i} - \prod_{i=1}^m \delta_{i,g_i} \right) \Upsilon \right].$$

To complete the proof, we show that the (scalar) expected value in the preceding display is of the same form as the second expression in (3.9), and we show that the corresponding weight, i.e., the trace of $(xx' - I_p)^{k-l} \prod_{i=1}^m a_{i,g_i}$, is as claimed.

To deal with the weight, we observe that we can factor out a matrix term $(xx')^m$ from the product of the a_{i,g_i} 's, so that $(xx' - I_p)^{k-l} \prod_{i=1}^m a_{i,g_i}$ equals $(xx' - I_p)^{k-l} (xx')^m$ times a scalar that depends only on the g_i 's and on the n_i 's, and the collection of all such g_i 's and n_i 's depends only on k . Obviously, the trace of that matrix is a polynomial in $\|x\|^2$, and the collection of all possible such polynomials depends only on k .

To deal with the expected value in the preceding display, fix a collection $(g_1, \dots, g_m)' \in \{0, 1, \dots, n_1\} \times \cdots \times \{0, 1, \dots, n_m\}$. In case $g_i \leq 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, the expected value above is equal to zero, because of $\gamma_{i,0} = \delta_{i,0} = \gamma_{i,1} = \delta_{i,1} = 1$. In view of this and of the exchangeability of the W_j 's, we may assume that $m \geq 1$ and that $g_i > 1$ for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, without loss of generality. Set $j_0 = 0$, $j_i = j_{i-1} + g_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and note that $\sum_{i=1}^m (g_i - 1) = j_m - m$ and $j_m \leq \sum_{i=1}^m n_i = l < k$. We therefore see that $\mathbb{E}[(\prod_{i=1}^m \gamma_{i,g_i} - \prod_{i=1}^m \delta_{i,g_i}) \Upsilon]$ equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m W'_{j_{i-1}+1} W_{j_{i-1}+2} \cdots W'_{j_i-1} W_{j_i} - \|x\|^{2(j_m-m)} \right) \Upsilon \right],$$

which coincides with the second expression in (3.9) with indices m and $j_0, \dots, j_m$ as claimed. $\square$

Appendix C: Proofs for Section 3.3

Lemma C.1. *For d, p, k , and $\eta(d, p, k)$ as in Proposition 3.2 with $k < d - p - 1$, we have*

$$\eta(d, p, k) \leq \exp \left[\frac{p^2}{d} \left(1 - \frac{p+k-1}{d} \right)^{-1} \frac{k^2}{2} \right].$$

Proof. Use the inequality

$$\frac{\Gamma(x)}{\Gamma(y)} < \frac{x^{x-1/2}}{y^{y-1/2}} e^{y-x},$$

for $x \geq y > 1$, proved in Kečkić and Vasić (1971, Theorem 1), to bound $\eta(d, p, k)$ by

$$\prod_{i=1}^k (d/2)^{-p/2} \frac{\left(\frac{d-i+1}{2}\right)^{(d-i)/2}}{\left(\frac{d-p-i+1}{2}\right)^{(d-p-i)/2}} e^{-p/2}.$$

The i -th factor in the above product equals

$$\left(\frac{d-i+1}{d-p-i+1}\right)^{(d-i)/2} \left(\frac{d-p-i+1}{d}\right)^{p/2} e^{-p/2}.$$

In this display, write the first expression in parentheses as $1+a$ where $a = p/(d-p-i+1)$, and note that $a > 0$. The second factor in parentheses is bounded by one, so that the expression in the preceding display is bounded by $(1+a)^{d/2} e^{-p/2} = [\exp(d \log(1+a) - p)]^{1/2}$. The argument of the exponential, i.e., $d \log(1+a) - p$, can be further bounded by

$$da - p = p \frac{p+i-1}{d-p-i+1} \leq p \frac{p+k-1}{d-p-k+1} \leq \frac{p^2}{d} \frac{k}{1-(p+k-1)/d},$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that the quantity on the left is increasing in i , and the second inequality holds because $p+k-1 \leq pk$. Together with the bound for $\eta(d, p, k)$ derived earlier, this gives the desired upper bound. $\square$

Lemma C.2. For $1 \leq k \leq d-p$, let $w_1, \dots, w_k$ be linearly independent vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and write N for the $d \times k$ matrix $N = [w_1, \dots, w_k]$. Moreover, let $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and set $\iota = (1, \dots, 1)' \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Then there exists a matrix $B \in \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ such that $[N, B]$ has full rank $k+p$ and such that

$$w_j = Bx + (I_d - BB')w_j \quad (\text{C.1})$$

holds for each $j = 1, \dots, k$, if and only if $\|x\|^2 \iota'(N'N)^{-1} \iota < 1$. If either one of these equivalent conditions hold, then the matrix $A = (I_d - N(N'N)^{-1}N')B$ satisfies $\det(A'A) = 1 - \|x\|^2 \iota'(N'N)^{-1} \iota$.

Proof. Set $\eta = \iota'(N'N)^{-1} \iota$, and note that one eigenvalue of $I_p - \eta xx'$ is $1 - \eta \|x\|^2$ and the others are 1. In particular, that matrix is positive definite if and only if $\|x\|^2 \eta < 1$.

Assume first that there exists a matrix B with the given properties. The relation (C.1) then entails that $B'N = x\iota'$. For A as in the lemma, we get

$$A'A = I_p - x\iota'(N'N)^{-1} \iota x' = I_p - \eta xx',$$

and it remains to show that $A'A$ is positive definite. To this end, fix a non-zero vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and note that $Bv \notin \text{span}\{N\}$ since $\text{span}\{N\} \cap \text{span}\{B\} = \{0\}$ and B has full rank, by assumption. Therefore $Av \neq 0$ and thus $v'A'Av = \|Av\|^2 > 0$.

Conversely, assume that $\|x\|^2\eta < 1$. Choose $C \in \mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ such that $C'N = 0$. By assumption, we see that the matrix $I_p - \eta xx'$ is positive definite and thus has a non-vanishing square root. Setting $B = N(N'N)^{-1}\iota x' + C(I_p - \eta xx')^{1/2}$, it is now easy to see that $B'B = I_p$. The relation (C.1) follows by noting, for $j = 1, \dots, k$, that

$$B'w_j = x\iota'(N'N)^{-1}N'w_j + (I_p - \eta xx')^{1/2}C'w_j = x\iota'(N'N)^{-1}N'Ne_j = x,$$

where e_j denotes the j -th standard basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^k$. To see that $[N, B]$ has full rank $k + p$, simply reverse the argument in the preceding paragraph. $\square$

For $1 \leq p < d$, consider a $d \times p$ -matrix $B = [\beta_{1-p}, \beta_{2-p}, \dots, \beta_0]$, a $d \times (d-p)$ -matrix $N = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{d-p}]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, such that $B'B = I_p$, such that $M = [B, N]$ has $\text{rank}(M) = d$, and such that $w_j = Bx + (I_d - BB')w_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, d-p$. Define the vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_j &= \frac{(I_d - P_{B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{j-1}})w_j}{\|(I_d - P_{B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{j-1}})w_j\|} & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, d-p, \\ c_j &= \frac{(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{j-1}})w_j}{\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{j-1}})w_j\|} & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, d-p, \\ c_j &= \frac{(I_d - P_{c_{j+1}, \dots, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{d-p}})\beta_j}{\|(I_d - P_{c_{j+1}, \dots, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{d-p}})\beta_j\|} & \text{for } j = 1-p, \dots, 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Here $P_{\dots}$ indicates the orthogonal projection on the span of the vectors in the subscript, and we adopt the conventions $\{y_1, \dots, y_{1-1}\} = \{y_{0+1}, \dots, y_0\} = \emptyset$ and $P_\emptyset = 0$. With this, set $\tilde{B} = [\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{d-p}]$, set $C = [c_{1-p}, \dots, c_0]$, and set $\tilde{C} = [c_1, \dots, c_{d-p}]$. By construction, the matrices $\mathcal{B} = [B, \tilde{B}]$ and $\mathcal{C} = [C, \tilde{C}]$ are both orthonormal. We will consider rotated versions of $M = [B, N]$ that are given by $\mathcal{B}'M$ and $\mathcal{C}'M$ and that we denote by S and T , respectively, with rows and columns numbered from $1-p$ to $d-p$. In other words, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S &= (s_{i,j})_{i=1-p}^{d-p}{}_{j=1-p}^{d-p} = \mathcal{B}'M = \begin{bmatrix} B'B & B'N \\ \tilde{B}'B & \tilde{B}'N \end{bmatrix}, \\ T &= (t_{i,j})_{i=1-p}^{d-p}{}_{j=1-p}^{d-p} = \mathcal{C}'M = \begin{bmatrix} C'B & C'N \\ \tilde{C}'B & \tilde{C}'N \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma C.3. *Let B , N , and x as in the preceding paragraph. For M , $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{C}$, T , and S , which are functions of B , N , and x , the following holds true.*

(i) *We have $S = \begin{bmatrix} I_p & x \cdots x \\ 0 & \tilde{B}'N \end{bmatrix}$. Moreover, $\tilde{B}'N$ is upper-triangular and its k -th column depends only on $w_1, \dots, w_k$ and x . In particular, S does not depend on B .*

(ii) *We have $C'N = 0$, and $\tilde{C}'N$ is upper-triangular. The k -th column of the matrix $\mathcal{B}'\tilde{C} = \begin{bmatrix} B'\tilde{C} \\ \tilde{B}'\tilde{C} \end{bmatrix}$ depends only on $w_1, \dots, w_k$ and on x . Moreover, the matrix $\tilde{B}'\tilde{C}$ is upper-triangular.*

(iii) For $1 \leq k \leq d - p$, set $\Lambda_k = (c'_i \beta_j)_{i,j=1}^k$. Then Λ_k is lower-triangular, depends only on $w_1, \dots, w_k$ and on x , and satisfies

$$\det(\Lambda_k \Lambda'_k) = \prod_{i=1}^k (c'_i \beta_i)^2 = 1 - \|x\|^2 \iota' [(w'_i w_j)_{i,j=1}^k]^{-1} \iota,$$

where $\iota = (1, \dots, 1)'$ denotes an appropriate vector of ones. Moreover, if $k > 1$ the vector $(t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k-1,k})'$ can be written as

$$(t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k-1,k})' = \zeta + \Lambda_{k-1}(s_{1,k}, \dots, s_{k-1,k})'$$

for a $(k-1)$ -vector ζ which is a function of the $w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}$ and x only.

(iv) For $1 \leq k \leq d - p$, the quantity $t_{k,k}$ can be written as

$$t_{k,k} = (\kappa_k^2 + s_{k,k}^2)^{1/2}.$$

In case $k > 1$, we have $\kappa_k^2 = \|P_{(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})B} w_k\|^2$, which is a function of $w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}$, $t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k-1,k}$, and x . In case $k=1$, we have $\kappa_1^2 = \|x\|^2$.

Proof of Lemma C.3. The first statement in part (i) is clear, since $B'B = I_p$, $B'N = x\iota'$ and $\tilde{B}'B = 0$, by construction. To show that $\tilde{B}'N = (s_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{d-p}$ is upper-triangular, fix i and j so that $1 \leq j < i \leq d - p$, and note that $s_{i,j} = \beta'_i w_j$ with

$$\beta'_i w_j = \frac{w'_i (I_d - P_{B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{i-1}}) w_j}{\|(I_d - P_{B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{i-1}}) w_i\|} = \frac{w'_i (I_d - P_{B, w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}}) w_j}{\|(I_d - P_{B, w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}}) w_i\|} = 0,$$

because $\text{span}\{B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{i-1}\} = \text{span}\{B, w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}\}$. It remains to show that the $s_{i,k}$'s with $1 \leq i \leq k$ depend only on $w_1, \dots, w_k$ and x . For $i = 1$ and $j = 1, \dots, d - p$, we have

$$s_{1,j} = \beta'_1 w_j = \frac{w'_1 (I_d - P_B) w_j}{\|(I_d - P_B) w_1\|} = \frac{w'_1 w_j - w'_1 B B' w_j}{(w'_1 w_1 - w'_1 B B' w_1)^{1/2}} = \frac{w'_1 w_j - \|x\|^2}{(w'_1 w_1 - \|x\|^2)^{1/2}}.$$

This shows that $s_{1,k}$ has the desired property, and it also shows that the first k elements of the first row of $\tilde{B}'N$ depend only on $w_1, \dots, w_k$ and x . Now, for general i satisfying $1 \leq i \leq k$ note that the $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{i-1}$ are mutually orthogonal and thus the projection onto their span equals the sum of the projections onto every single one of them. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} s_{i,k} &= \beta'_i w_k = \frac{w'_i (I_d - P_{B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{i-1}}) w_k}{\|(I_d - P_{B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{i-1}}) w_i\|} = \frac{w'_i w_k - \sum_{j=1-p}^{i-1} w'_i \beta_j \beta'_j w_k}{\left(w'_i w_i - \sum_{j=1-p}^{i-1} (\beta'_j w_i)^2\right)^{1/2}} = \\ &= \frac{w'_i w_k - \sum_{j=1-p}^{i-1} s_{j,i} s_{j,k}}{\left(w'_i w_i - \sum_{j=1-p}^{i-1} (s_{j,i})^2\right)^{1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we see that $s_{i,k}$ only depends on w_i , on w_k , on x , and on elements of $\tilde{B}'N$ in the upper left sub-matrix of the first $i-1$ rows and k columns. Hence, the claim follows inductively.

For part (ii), we have $C'N = 0$, because $C'N = (c'_i w_j)_{i=1-p, j=1}^{d-p}$, and because $\text{span}\{w_1, \dots, w_{d-p}\} = \text{span}\{c_1, \dots, c_{d-p}\} = \text{span}\{c_{1-p}, \dots, c_0\}^\perp$. And for $\tilde{C}'N = (c'_i w_j)_{i,j=1}^{d-p}$, we have $c'_i w_j = 0$ whenever $i > j$ by construction of the c_i 's. To show that $\tilde{B}'\tilde{C} = (\beta'_i c_j)_{i,j=1}^{d-p}$ is upper-triangular, take i, j with $1 \leq j < i \leq d-p$, and note that $c_j \in \text{span}\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}$ while β_i is orthogonal to the span of $B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{i-1}$ or, equivalently, to the span of $B, w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}$. Now consider the k -th column of $\tilde{B}'\tilde{C}$, $1 \leq k \leq d-p$. For the non-zero elements of this column, take i so that $1-p \leq i \leq k$, and consider $\beta'_i c_k$. Because $w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}$ span the same space as $c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta'_i c_k &= \frac{\beta'_i (I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}}) w_k}{\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}}) w_k\|} = \frac{\beta'_i (I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}}) w_k}{\|(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}}) w_k\|} \\ &= \frac{\beta'_i w_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (\beta'_i c_j) (c'_j w_k)}{\left(w'_k w_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (c'_j w_k)^2\right)^{1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

In this display, the c_j 's depend only on $w_1, \dots, w_j$, so that the terms $c'_j w_k$ depend only on $w_1, \dots, w_k$. And by part (i), the terms $\beta'_i w_k = s_{i,k}$ depend only on $w_1, \dots, w_k$ and x . With this, the proof is completed inductively by arguing as in part (i), mutatis mutandis.

For part (iii), we first note that $\tilde{B}'\tilde{C}$ is upper-triangular by part (ii), and hence Λ_k is lower-triangular, which yields $\det(\Lambda_k \Lambda'_k) = \det(\Lambda_k)^2 = \prod_{i=1}^k (c'_i \beta_i)^2$. For $i \geq 1$, set $N_{(i)} = (w_1, \dots, w_i)$ and $A_{(i)} = (I_d - P_{N_{(i)}})B$, and set $N_{(0)} = 0$. Now note that $\text{span}\{B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{i-1}\} = \text{span}\{B, N_{(i-1)}\}$, and calculate $(c'_i \beta_i)^2$ as

$$\frac{(w'_i (I_d - P_{N_{(i-1)}}) (I_d - P_{B, N_{(i-1)}}) w_i)^2}{\|(I_d - P_{N_{(i-1)}}) w_i\|^2 \|(I_d - P_{B, N_{(i-1)}}) w_i\|^2} = \frac{w'_i (I_d - P_{B, N_{(i-1)}}) w_i}{w'_i (I_d - P_{N_{(i-1)}}) w_i}.$$

The numerator and the denominator on the right can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \det(w'_i (I_d - P_{B, N_{(i-1)}}) w_i) &= \frac{\det([B, N_{(i)}]' [B, N_{(i)}])}{\det([B, N_{(i-1)}]' [B, N_{(i-1)}])} \text{ and} \\ \det(w'_i (I_d - P_{N_{(i-1)}}) w_i) &= \frac{\det(N'_{(i)} N_{(i)})}{\det(N'_{(i-1)} N_{(i-1)})}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, upon noting that $\det([X, Y]' [X, Y]) = \det(X'X) \det(Y'(I - P_X)Y)$ for appropriate matrices X and Y ; cf. Rao (1973, Problem 2.4). Using that relation again, the numerator, i.e., the first expression in the preceding display, can be further re-expressed as

$$\frac{\det(N'_{(i)} N_{(i)}) \det(B' (I_d - P_{N_{(i)}}) B)}{\det(N'_{(i-1)} N_{(i-1)}) \det(B' (I_d - P_{N_{(i-1)}}) B)} = \frac{\det(N'_{(i)} N_{(i)}) \det(A'_{(i)} A_{(i)})}{\det(N'_{(i-1)} N_{(i-1)}) \det(A'_{(i-1)} A_{(i-1)})}.$$

Note that $\det(A'_{(i)}A_{(i)}) = 1 - \|x\|^2 \iota'(N'_{(i)}N_{(i)})^{-1}\iota > 0$ for $i \geq 1$ by Lemma C.2, and that $\det(A'_{(0)}A_{(0)}) = 1$. Taking the pieces together, we see that $\prod_{i=1}^k (c'_i \beta_i)^2 = \det(A'_{(k)}A_{(k)}) = 1 - \|x\|^2 \iota'(N'_{(k)}N_{(k)})^{-1}\iota$, as claimed. For the last statement, we first note that we have $M = \mathcal{B}S$, because $\mathcal{B}$ is orthogonal. For the k -th column of M , we thus have $w_k = \sum_{i=1-p}^{d-p} \beta_i s_{i,k} = Bx + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i s_{i,k}$, where the second equality follows from part (i). Take now $k > 1$, and consider the vector $(t_{i,k})_{i=1}^{k-1} = (c'_i w_k)_{i=1}^{k-1}$. Using the last formula for w_k , we see that

$$\begin{pmatrix} t_{1,k} \\ \vdots \\ t_{k-1,k} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c'_1 \\ \vdots \\ c'_{k-1} \end{pmatrix} Bx + \begin{pmatrix} c'_1 \\ \vdots \\ c'_{k-1} \end{pmatrix} (\beta_1 \cdots \beta_{k-1}) \begin{pmatrix} s_{1,k} \\ \vdots \\ s_{k-1,k} \end{pmatrix}$$

because $c'_i \beta_k = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ in view of part (ii). We thus see that $(t_{i,k})_{i=1}^{k-1}$ can be decomposed as claimed. Finally, the statements that Λ_k depends only on $w_1, \dots, w_k$ and x , and that ζ and $(t_{i,k})_{i=1}^{k-1}$ depend only on $w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}$ and x (in case $k > 1$), follow from part (i) and (ii).

For part (iv), we immediately obtain that $t_{1,1} = c'_1 w_1 = \|w_1\| = (\|Bx\|^2 + \|\beta_1 s_{1,1}\|^2)^{1/2} = (\|x\|^2 + s_{1,1}^2)^{1/2}$ because $w_1 = Bx + (I_d - P_B)w_1$. In the remaining cases, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_{k,k} &= c'_k w_k = \|(I_d - P_{N_{(k-1)}})w_k\| = \|(P_{B, N_{(k)}} - P_{N_{(k-1)}})w_k\| \\ &= \|(P_{B, N_{(k-1)}} + P_{(I_d - P_{B, N_{(k-1)}})w_k} - P_{N_{(k-1)}})w_k\| \\ &= \|(P_{(I_d - P_{N_{(k-1)}})B} + P_{(I_d - P_{B, N_{(k-1)}})w_k})w_k\| \\ &= \left(\|P_{(I_d - P_{N_{(k-1)}})B}w_k\|^2 + \|P_{\beta_k}w_k\|^2 \right)^{1/2} = (\kappa_k^2 + s_{k,k}^2)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last two equalities are obtained by noting that $(I_d - P_{N_{(k-1)}})B \perp \beta_k$ and that $\|P_{\beta_k}w_k\|^2 = w'_k \beta_k \beta'_k w_k = s_{k,k}^2$. To see that κ_k^2 is a function of $w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}, t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k-1,k}$ and x only, set $\eta_k = \iota'(N'_{(k)}N_{(k)})^{-1}\iota$, set $\tilde{C}_{(k)}$ equal to the matrix consisting of the first k columns of $\tilde{C}$, and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_k^2 &= w'_k (I_d - P_{N_{(k-1)}})B [B'(I_d - P_{N_{(k-1)}})B]^{-1} B'(I_d - P_{N_{(k-1)}})w_k \\ &= w'_k (I_d - \tilde{C}_{(k-1)}\tilde{C}'_{(k-1)})B [I_p - xx'\eta_{(k-1)}]^{-1} B'(I_d - \tilde{C}_{(k-1)}\tilde{C}'_{(k-1)})w_k, \end{aligned}$$

because $B'w_i = x$, and because $N_{(k-1)}$ and $\tilde{C}_{(k-1)}$ span the same space. We further analyze the expressions to the left and right of the inverse, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} B'(I_d - \tilde{C}_{(k-1)}\tilde{C}'_{(k-1)})w_k &= x - B'\tilde{C}_{(k-1)}\tilde{C}'_{(k-1)}w_k \\ &= x - B'\tilde{C}_{(k-1)}(t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k-1,k})'. \end{aligned}$$

Now, in view of part (ii), $B'\tilde{C}_{(k-1)}$ depends only on $w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}$ and x . Together with part (iii), we see that κ_k^2 does indeed depend only on the claimed quantities. $\square$

We now replace the deterministic matrices $B = [\beta_{1-p}, \dots, \beta_0]$ and the vectors $w_1, \dots, w_{d-p}$ by their random counterparts $\mathbf{B} = [b_{1-p}, \dots, b_0]$ and $W_1, \dots, W_{d-p}$, where $\mathbf{B}$ and the W_j 's are as in (3.5) with $d-p$ replacing k (and where $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is fixed throughout). Because the event where the column-vectors of $\mathbf{B}$ and the vectors $W_1, \dots, W_{d-p}$ are linearly independent has probability one, we can assume, without loss of generality, that these vectors are linearly independent. In the following, re-define the matrices N , $\tilde{B}$, C , and $\tilde{C}$ as in the discussion leading up to Lemma C.3 but with $\mathbf{B}$ and the W_j 's replacing B and the w_j 's, respectively.

Lemma C.4. *Let $\mathbf{B}$, $W_1, \dots, W_{d-p}$, and x as in the preceding paragraph. For $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{C}$, S , and T , which are functions of $\mathbf{B}$, $W_1, \dots, W_{d-p}$, and x , the following holds true.*

- (i) *The matrices $\mathcal{B}$ and S are independent with $\mathcal{B}$ uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{V}_{d,d}$. Furthermore, the random variables $s_{i,j}$, $1-p \leq i \leq d-p$, $1 \leq j \leq d-p$, are independent, and distributed as follows: For j satisfying $1 \leq j \leq d-p$, we have $(s_{1-p,j}, \dots, s_{d-p,j})' = (x_1, \dots, x_p, s_{1,j}, \dots, s_{j,j}, 0, \dots, 0)'$ with $s_{i,j} \sim N(0, 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, j-1$ and $s_{j,j} \sim (\chi_{d-p-j+1}^2)^{1/2}$.*
- (ii) *The random matrices $\mathcal{C}$ and T are independent with $\mathcal{C}$ uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{V}_{d,d}$.*

Proof. Note that both $S = S(M)$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(M)$ are functions of M , and that the law of M is left invariant under transformations from $\mathcal{V}_{d,d}$, in the sense that AM is distributed as M for any $A \in \mathcal{V}_{d,d}$. [Indeed, $M = M(\mathbf{B}, V_1, \dots, V_{d-p})$ is a function of orthogonally invariant random vectors and satisfies $AM = M(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{A}V_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}V_{d-p})$ for any $A \in \mathcal{V}_{d,d}$.] Take $\mathbf{A}$ uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{V}_{d,d}$ and independent of M . Then the law of $(\mathcal{B}(M), S(M))$ coincides with the law of $(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{A}M), S(\mathbf{A}M))$, and it is easy to see that $(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{A}M), S(\mathbf{A}M)) = (\mathbf{A}\mathcal{B}(M), S(M))$. Hence,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B}(M) \\ S(M) \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}\mathcal{B}(M) \\ S(M) \end{pmatrix}.$$

On the right-hand side of this display, $\mathbf{A}\mathcal{B}(M)$ is uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{V}_{d,d}$ conditional on M , and thus also unconditionally. This also entails that $\mathbf{A}\mathcal{B}(M)$ is independent of M and, hence, of $S(M)$. From the above display we therefore obtain that $\mathcal{B}$ is uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{V}_{d,d}$ and it is independent of S . A similar argument shows that $\mathcal{C}$ also is uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{V}_{d,d}$ and is independent of T .

It remains to consider the joint distribution of the $s_{i,j}$'s, with $1-p \leq i \leq d-p$ and $1 \leq j \leq d-p$. Some $s_{i,j}$'s are degenerate, as described by Lemma C.3(i). For the non-degenerate $s_{i,j}$'s, i.e., for those where we have $1 \leq i \leq j \leq d-p$, recall that the vectors $b_{1-p}, \dots, b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{d-p}$ are mutually orthogonal, so that

$$s_{i,j} = b_i' W_j = b_i' (\mathbf{B}x + (I_d - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}')V_j) = b_i' V_j$$

for $i = 1, \dots, j-1$ and

$$s_{j,j} = b_j' W_j = (V_j'(I_d - P_{b_{1-p}, \dots, b_0, \dots, b_{j-1}})V_j)^{1/2}$$

for each fixed j with $1 \leq j \leq d-p$. Note that $b_{1-p}, \dots, b_{j-1}$ are functions of $B, W_1, \dots, W_{j-1}$. Hence, conditional on $B, W_1, \dots, W_{j-1}$, we see that the random variables $s_{1,j}, \dots, s_{j,j}$ are independent and distributed as claimed (conditionally). Because their conditional distribution does not depend on the conditioning variables, they are independent of the conditioning random variables, and their conditional distribution coincides with their unconditional distribution. In other words, $s_{1,j}, \dots, s_{j,j}$ are jointly distributed as stated in the lemma; moreover, they are independent of $B, W_1, \dots, W_{j-1}$ and hence also independent of the $s_{i,k}$'s with $k < j$ (in view of Lemma C.3(i)). As this holds for each $j = 1, \dots, d-p$, it is easy to see that the $s_{i,j}$'s are all independent. [Use the independence relations established so far to argue that the, say, joint characteristic function of all the $s_{i,j}$'s can be factorized into the product of the joint characteristic function of the $s_{i,k}$'s with $k < d-p$ and the marginal characteristic functions of the $s_{i,d-p}$'s. Now repeat this argument with $d-p$ replaced by $d-p-1, d-p-2, \dots, 2$.] $\square$

Corollary C.5. Fix k satisfying $1 \leq k \leq d-p$, and let ζ , Λ_k , and κ_k^2 be as in Lemma C.3 but with W_j replacing w_j .

(i) In case $k > 1$ and conditional on $W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}$, the vector $(t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k-1,k})'$ is distributed as $N(\zeta, \Lambda_{k-1} \Lambda_k')$.

(ii) In case $k > 1$ and conditional on $W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}, t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k-1,k}$, the quantities c_k and $t_{k,k}$ are independent and distributed as follows: We have $t_{k,k} \sim (\kappa_k^2 + \chi_{d-p-k+1}^2)^{1/2}$ (conditionally), i.e., $t_{k,k}$ is distributed as the square root of the sum of κ_k^2 and a chi-square distributed random variable with $d-p-k+1$ degrees of freedom (conditionally). Moreover, the vector c_k is distributed as $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{V}_{d,1} \cap [W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}]^\perp)$ (conditionally), where $\mathcal{U}(\dots)$ denotes the uniform distribution on the indicated set, and where $\mathcal{V}_{d,1}$ denotes the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$ by our conventions. In case $k = 1$, these statements apply unconditionally, *mutatis mutandis*.

Proof. For part (i), it suffices to show that the vector $v = (s_{1,k}, \dots, s_{k-1,k})'$ is distributed as $N(0, I_{k-1})$ and is independent of $W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}$, in view of Lemma C.3(iii). From Lemma C.4(i), we see that v does indeed have the $N(0, I_{k-1})$ distribution, unconditionally, and Lemma C.4(i) also shows that v is independent of $\mathcal{B}$ and of the $s_{i,j}$'s with $1 \leq j < k$. Noting that $W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}$ are functions of $\mathcal{B}$ and of the $s_{i,j}$'s with $1 \leq j < k$ completes the argument.

For part (ii), consider first the case where $k = 1$. Here, we have $c_1 \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{V}_{d,1})$ independently of $t_{1,1}$ in view of Lemma C.4(ii). And for the distribution of $t_{1,1}$, we note that $t_{1,1} = (\|x\|^2 + s_{1,1}^2)^{1/2}$ by Lemma C.3(iv), and that $s_{1,1}^2 \sim \chi_{d-p}^2$ by Lemma C.4(i).

For part (ii) with $k > 1$, write L_k as shorthand for the list of conditioning variables under consideration, i.e., for $W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}, t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k-1,k}$, and write $\tilde{L}_k$ for the list of random variables consisting of $c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}$, of the $t_{i,j}$'s with $1 \leq i \leq j < k$, and of the $t_{i,k}$'s with $1 \leq i < k$. Note that conditioning on L_k is equivalent to conditioning on $\tilde{L}_k$ (because there is a measurable bijection between the two groups of conditioning variables in view of Lemma C.3). We now proceed similarly as in the case $k = 1$, and note first that c_k and $t_{k,k}$ are conditionally independent given L_k . [Indeed, $\mathcal{C}$ and T are independent by Lemma C.4(ii), such that both the conditional distribution of (a) c_k given $\tilde{L}_k$ and $t_{k,k}$, and also the conditional distribution of (b) c_k given $\tilde{L}_k$, coincides with the conditional distribution of (c) c_k given $c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}$. Because the conditional distributions (a) and (b) coincide, it follows that c_k and $t_{k,k}$ are conditionally independent given $\tilde{L}_k$ or, equivalently, given L_k .³] Next, we note that c_k given L_k is distributed as claimed. [It suffices to note that the conditional distribution (b) agrees with the conditional distribution (c) mentioned earlier, and that the latter is $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{V}_{d,1} \cap [c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}]^\perp)$ or, equivalently, $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{V}_{d,1} \cap [W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}]^\perp)$.] Finally, to obtain the conditional distribution of $t_{k,k}$ given L_k , it remains to show that $s_{k,k}^2$ is independent of L_k (because $t_{k,k} = (\kappa_k^2 + s_{k,k}^2)^{1/2}$ with κ_k^2 being a function of L_k in view of Lemma C.3(iv), and because $s_{k,k}^2 \sim \chi_{d-p-k+1}^2$ (unconditionally) by Lemma C.4(i)). To this end, we again use Lemma C.4(i) to see that $s_{k,k}$ is independent of $\mathcal{B}$ and of the $s_{i,j}$'s with $(i,j) \neq (k,k)$, and we note that the random variables in L_k are functions of $\mathcal{B}$ and of the $s_{i,j}$'s with $(i,j) \neq (k,k)$. [Indeed, the vectors $W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}$ are functions of $\mathcal{B}$ and of the $s_{i,j}$'s with $j < k$. Moreover, by Lemma C.3(iii), the vector $(t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k-1,k})'$ is a function of the $W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}$ and of $(s_{1,k}, \dots, s_{k-1,k})'$.] $\square$

Lemma C.6. *For positive integers $2 \leq k \leq d$, let $q_1, \dots, q_k$ be independent random variables with $q_i \sim N(0, 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ and $q_k \sim (\chi_{d-k+1}^2)^{1/2}$, and let $c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}$ be fixed orthonormal d -vectors, while $c_k \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{V}_{d,1} \cap [c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}]^\perp)$ is independent of all the q_i with $i = 1, \dots, k$. Finally, set $U = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q_i c_i + q_k c_k$. Then $U \sim N(0, I_d)$.*

Proof. Let $C = [c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}]$, and let D denote a $d \times (d - k + 1)$ matrix so that $M = [C, D]$ is orthogonal. Set $V = (q_1, \dots, q_{k-1})'$, and take $W \sim N(0, I_{d-k+1})$ independent of V , q_k and c_k . Now observe that $\mathbb{P}(DW = 0) = 0$ and thus

$$DW = \|DW\| \frac{DW}{\|DW\|} = \|W\| D \frac{W}{\|W\|}$$

almost surely. Note that $\|W\|$ and $W/\|W\|$ are independent with $\|W\| \sim (\chi_{d-k+1}^2)^{1/2}$ and $W/\|W\| \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{V}_{d,1})$, because the law of W is spherically symmetric (cf. also Cambanis et al. (1981, Theorem 1)). Hence, $D \frac{W}{\|W\|}$ and $\|W\|$ are independent and distributed as c_k and q_k , respectively. Therefore we have

$$U \sim CV + DW = M[V', W']' \sim N(0, I_d),$$

³ See Sections 6.12 and 6.15 in Hoffmann-Jørgensen (1994a) for some basic facts about conditional independence.

due to rotation invariance of the standard normal distribution. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.2. For later use, let $q_{i,k}$, $1 \leq i \leq k \leq d-p$, be independent random variables such that $q_{k,k} \sim (\chi_{d-k+1}^2)^{1/2}$ and $q_{i,k} \sim N(0,1)$ for $i < k$, and such that the $q_{i,j}$'s are jointly independent of all the other quantities considered so far.

Because the W_j for $1 \leq j \leq k$ are defined by (3.5) and are such that the columns of $\mathbf{B} = [b_{1-p}, \dots, b_0]$ and $W_1, \dots, W_k$ are linearly independent with probability 1, we can set $\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k) = 0$ unless the w_j , $1 \leq j \leq k$, are linearly independent and such that (C.1) is satisfied for some non-random $d \times p$ -matrix $B = (\beta_{1-p}, \dots, \beta_0)$ that satisfies $B'B = I_p$ and $\text{rank}([b_{1-p}, \dots, \beta_0, w_1, \dots, w_k]) = p+k$. Equivalently, we may set $\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k) = 0$ whenever either $S_k = (w'_i w_j / d)_{i,j=1}^k$ is not invertible or $\|x\|^2 \iota' S_k^{-1} \iota \geq d$ (cf. Lemma C.2). Assume, from now on, that S_k is invertible and that $\|x\|^2 \iota' S_k^{-1} \iota < d$.

We derive the density ratio in Proposition 3.2 by induction on k . First, for the case where $k = 1$, we see that $W_1 = c_1 t_{1,1}$, since $M = \mathcal{C}T$ and in view of the structure of T described by Lemma C.3(ii). Moreover, c_1 and $t_{1,1}$ are independent with $c_1 \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{V}_{d,1})$ and $t_{1,1} \sim (\|x\|^2 + \chi_{d-p}^2)^{1/2}$, by Corollary C.5(ii). Now we use Lemma C.5 in Leeb (2013b) with $k = 1$, and with c_1 , $q_{1,1}$ and $t_{1,1}$ replacing the quantities v_1 , q_1 and t_1 , respectively, in that reference. Noting that $q_{1,1} c_1 \sim N(0, I_d)$ in view of Lemma C.6, we obtain that $\varphi_x(w_1)/\phi(w_1)$ is the ratio of the density of the $(\|x\|^2 + \chi_{d-p}^2)^{1/2}$ -distribution and the density of the $(\chi_d^2)^{1/2}$ -distribution, both evaluated at $\|w_1\|$. After simplification, we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi_x(w_1)}{\phi(w_1)} &= 2^{p/2} \frac{\Gamma(d/2)}{\Gamma((d-p)/2)} (\|w_1\|^2)^{-p/2} (1 - \|x\|^2/\|w_1\|^2)^{\frac{d-p-2}{2}} e^{\frac{\|x\|^2}{2}} \\ &= \frac{(d/2)^{-p/2} \Gamma(d/2)}{\Gamma((d-p)/2)} (\det S_1)^{-p/2} \left(1 - \frac{\|x\|^2}{d} \iota' S_1^{-1} \iota\right)^{\frac{d-p-2}{2}} e^{\frac{\|x\|^2}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

Suppose now that $k > 1$ and that the proposition holds with $k-1$ replacing k , and consider the conditional distribution of W_k given $W_1 = w_1, \dots, W_{k-1} = w_{k-1}$. Here, W_k can be written as $W_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_{i,k} c_i + t_{k,k} c_k$, because $M = \mathcal{C}T$ and in view of Lemma C.3(ii). Set $U_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q_{i,k} c_i + q_{k,k} c_k$. Conditional on $W_1 = w_1, \dots, W_{k-1} = w_{k-1}$, first note that the orthonormal vectors $c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}$ are functions of $W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}$ by construction, while $c_k \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{V}_{d,1} \cap [c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}]^\perp)$ (in view of Corollary C.5(ii) and because $W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}$ and $c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}$ span the same space). Second, note that $(q_{1,k}, \dots, q_{k,k})$ and $(t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k,k})$ are both conditionally independent of c_k given $W_1 = w_1, \dots, W_{k-1} = w_{k-1}$. [This is obvious for the $q_{i,k}$'s, and this follows from Corollary C.5(ii) for the $t_{i,k}$'s.] And third, note that the conditional distribution of $(t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k,k})$ given $W_1 = w_1, \dots, W_{k-1} = w_{k-1}$ is described by

Corollary C.5. In view of these three observations, it is now elementary to verify that Lemma C.5 in Leeb (2013b) applies, with k as chosen here, and with $c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}, c_k, q_{1,k}, \dots, q_{k,k}$, and $t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k,k}$ replacing $v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, v_k, q_1, \dots, q_k$, and $t_1, \dots, t_k$, respectively. In particular, we see that the conditional law of W_k given $W_1 = w_1, \dots, W_{k-1} = w_{k-1}$ has a density relative to the conditional law of U_k . Note that $U_k \sim N(0, I_d)$ conditional on $c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}$ or, equivalently, conditional on $W_1, \dots, W_{k-1}$ by Lemma C.6. Therefore, the conditional law of W_k given $W_1 = w_1, \dots, W_{k-1} = w_{k-1}$ has a Lebesgue density which we denote by $\varphi_x(w_k|w_1, \dots, w_{k-1})$. This entails that a Lebesgue density $\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k)$ of $W_1, \dots, W_k$ is well-defined by the relation

$$\frac{\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k)}{\phi(w_1) \cdots \phi(w_k)} = \frac{\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_{k-1})}{\phi(w_1) \cdots \phi(w_{k-1})} \frac{\varphi_x(w_k|w_1, \dots, w_{k-1})}{\phi(w_k)}. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

To complete the proof, it remains to explicitly compute the expression on the right-hand side of (C.3) and to show that it coincides with the right-hand side of the formula given in the proposition. Recall that we already have a formula for the first fraction on the right-hand side (by the induction assumption).

To compute the second fraction on the right side of (C.3) we first use Lemma C.5 in Leeb (2013b) to see that

$$\frac{\varphi_x(w_k|w_1, \dots, w_{k-1})}{\phi(w_k)} = \frac{f_t}{f_q}(c'_1 w_k, \dots, c'_{k-1} w_k, \|(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}})w_k\|), \quad (\text{C.4})$$

where f_t and f_q denote the conditional Lebesgue densities of $(t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k,k})$ and $(q_{1,k}, \dots, q_{k,k})$, respectively, given $W_1 = w_1, \dots, W_{k-1} = w_{k-1}$. Now, by definition of $q_{1,k}, \dots, q_{k,k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f_q(c'_1 w_k, \dots, c'_{k-1} w_k, \|(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}})w_k\|) \\ &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} f_{N(0,1)}(c'_i w_k) \right) f_{(\chi_{d-k+1}^2)^{1/2}}(\|(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}})w_k\|) \\ &= \frac{\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^{d-k}}{\pi^{(k-1)/2} 2^{(d-2)/2} \Gamma((d-k+1)/2)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|w_k\|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where, in the first equality, we use the symbols $f_{N(0,1)}$ and $f_{(\chi_{d-k+1}^2)^{1/2}}$ to denote the Lebesgue densities of the distributions indicated in the subscript, and where the second equality follows from elementary simplifications and by noting that

$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (c'_i w_k)^2 = w'_k P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}} w_k$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& f_t(c'_1 w_k, \dots, c'_{k-1} w_k, \|(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}})w_k\|) \\
&= f_{N(\zeta, \Lambda_{k-1} \Lambda'_{k-1})}(c'_1 w_k, \dots, c'_{k-1} w_k) f_{(\kappa_k^2 + \chi_{d-p-k+1}^2)^{1/2}}(\|(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}})w_k\|) \\
&= \frac{2^{-(d-p-2)/2} \pi^{-(k-1)/2}}{\Gamma((d-p-k+1)/2)} (\det \Lambda_{k-1} \Lambda'_{k-1})^{-1/2} \\
&\quad \times \|(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}})w_k\| \left(\|(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}})w_k\|^2 - \kappa_k^2 \right)^{(d-p-k-1)/2} \\
&\quad \times \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \|(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}})w_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_k^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|(s_{1,k}, \dots, s_{k-1,k})'\|^2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Corollary C.5 upon noting that Λ_{k-1} is invertible. [Indeed, note that $\det \Lambda_{k-1} \Lambda'_{k-1} = 1 - \|x\|^2 \iota'[(w'_i w_j)_{i,j=1}^{k-1}]^{-1} \iota$ by Lemma C.3(iii), and that $\|x\|^2 \iota'[(w'_i w_j)_{i,j=1}^{k-1}]^{-1} \iota < 1$ by Lemma C.2 and in view of our assumptions on the w_i 's.] The second equality is obtained by elementary simplifications, upon noting that $(c'_1 w_k, \dots, c'_{k-1} w_k) = (t_{1,k}, \dots, t_{k-1,k})$ by definition, and upon using Lemma C.3(iii).

To further simplify the formula in the preceding display, recall the $d \times p$ -matrix B introduced at the beginning of the proof, and note that $\kappa_k^2 = \|P_{(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})B} w_k\|^2$ by Lemma C.3(iv). Also, note that $\|(s_{1,k}, \dots, s_{k-1,k})'\| = \|(\beta'_1 w_k, \dots, \beta'_{k-1} w_k)'\| = \|P_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{k-1}} w_k\|$, and that $\text{span}\{B, c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}\} = \text{span}\{B, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}\} = \text{span}\{B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{k-1}\}$, by our conventions (cf. the discussion leading up to Lemma C.3). With this, the exponent on the far right-hand side of the preceding display can be written as $1/2$ times

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\|(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}})w_k\|^2 + \|P_{(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})B} w_k\|^2 - \|P_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{k-1}} w_k\|^2 \\
&= -\|w_k\|^2 + \|P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}} w_k\|^2 + \|P_{(I_d - P_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}})B} w_k\|^2 - \|P_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{k-1}} w_k\|^2 \\
&= -\|w_k\|^2 + \|P_{B, c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}} w_k\|^2 - \|P_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{k-1}} w_k\|^2 \\
&= -\|w_k\|^2 + \|P_{B, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{k-1}} w_k\|^2 - \|P_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{k-1}} w_k\|^2 \\
&= -\|w_k\|^2 + \|P_B w_k\|^2 = -\|w_k\|^2 + \|x\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds in view of (C.1). Plugging the formulae for $f_q(\dots)$ and for $f_t(\dots)$ obtained so far into (C.4), again using the formula for κ_k^2 , and simplifying, we can re-write the right-hand side of (C.4) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{2^{p/2} \Gamma((d-k+1)/2)}{\Gamma((d-p-k+1)/2)} (\det \Lambda_{k-1} \Lambda'_{k-1})^{-1/2} (\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2)^{-p/2} \\
& \times \left(1 - \frac{\|P_{(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})B} w_k\|^2}{\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2} \right)^{(d-p-k-1)/2} e^{\|x\|^2/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma C.3(iii), we see that $\det \Lambda_{k-1} \Lambda'_{k-1} = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (c'_i \beta_i)^2$, while the

expression under the $(d - p - k - 1)/2$ exponent can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2 - \|P_{(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})B}w_k\|^2}{\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2} \\
&= \frac{w'_k w_k - \left(\|P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}}w_k\|^2 + \|P_{(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})B}w_k\|^2 \right)}{\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2} \\
&= \frac{w'_k w_k - \|P_{B, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}}w_k\|^2}{\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2} \frac{\|(I_d - P_{B, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2}{\|(I_d - P_{B, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2} \\
&= \frac{(w'_k (I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})(I_d - P_{B, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k)^2}{\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2 \|(I_d - P_{B, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2} = (c'_k \beta_k)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second-to-last equality holds because of $P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}}(I_d - P_{B, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}}) = 0$, and where the last equality follows from the definition of c_k and β_k . Moreover, we also see that

$$\|(I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k\|^2 = \det w'_k (I_d - P_{w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}})w_k = d \frac{\det S_k}{\det S_{k-1}}$$

by again using the relation $\det([X, Y]'[X, Y]) = \det(X'X) \det(Y'(I - P_X)Y)$ for appropriate matrices X and Y . So putting the pieces together, we obtain that the conditional density $\varphi_x(w_k | w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}) / \phi(w_k)$ can be written as

$$\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \frac{\Gamma((d - k + 1)/2)}{\Gamma((d - p - k + 1)/2)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} c'_i \beta_i\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\det S_k}{\det S_{k-1}}\right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} (c'_k \beta_k)^{d-p-k-1} e^{\frac{\|x\|^2}{2}}.$$

We now take the formula for $\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}) / (\phi(w_1) \cdots \phi(w_{k-1}))$ given by Proposition 3.2 (with $k - 1$ replacing k). We can write $\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}) / (\phi(w_1) \cdots \phi(w_{k-1}))$ as

$$\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{-\frac{(k-1)p}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\Gamma((d - i + 1)/2)}{\Gamma((d - p - i + 1)/2)} \det(S_{k-1})^{-\frac{p}{2}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} c'_i \beta_i\right)^{d-p-k} e^{\frac{(k-1)}{2}\|x\|^2}$$

in view of Lemma C.3(iii). Multiplying the expressions in the preceding two displays, we see that the density $\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k) / (\phi(w_1) \cdots \phi(w_k))$ is given by

$$\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{-\frac{kp}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{\Gamma((d - i + 1)/2)}{\Gamma((d - p - i + 1)/2)} \det(S_k)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k c'_i \beta_i\right)^{d-p-k-1} e^{\frac{k}{2}\|x\|^2},$$

which, after another application of Lemma C.3(iii), equals the density ratio in Proposition 3.2, as desired. The property of the normalizing constant is now established by Lemma C.1. $\square$

Appendix D: Proofs for Section 3.5

Lemma D.1. Fix $M > 1$ and positive integers k and p . For $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d > 4(k + p + 1)M^4$, fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $\|x\| \leq M$, and define $g_1(z)$ by

$$g_1(z) = \left(1 - \frac{\|x\|^2}{d}z\right)^{(d-p-k-1)/2} e^{\frac{k}{2}\|x\|^2}$$

for $z < d/\|x\|^2$. Then $g_1(z)$ can be expanded as

$$g_1(z) = p_1(z - k) + r_1(z - k) + \delta_1,$$

where $p_1(y) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^k (-\|x\|^2/2)^j y^j/j!$; where r_1 is a polynomial of degree k whose coefficients depend on d , p , k and $\|x\|^2$, and whose coefficients are bounded in absolute value by $\frac{pM^{2(k+2)}}{d}c_1$, where $c_1 = c_1(k)$ is a constant that depends only on k ; and where the remainder term δ_1 satisfies

$$\sup_{z: |z-k| < 1} \frac{|\delta_1|}{|z-k|^{k+1}} \leq \frac{M^{2(k+1)}}{2^{k+1}(k+1)!} e^{\frac{k}{2}M^2}.$$

Proof. We begin with a k -th order Taylor expansion of g_1 around k :

$$g_1(z) = \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{g_1^{(j)}(k)}{j!} (z - k)^j + \frac{g_1^{(k+1)}(\zeta)}{(k+1)!} (z - k)^{k+1}$$

for some ζ between z and k . Now set δ_1 equal to the remainder term in the above expansion, i.e., $\delta_1 = \delta_1(z) = (g_1^{(k+1)}(\zeta))(z - k)^{k+1}/(k+1)!$, define p_1 as in the lemma and set r_1 equal to $r_1(y) = \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{g_1^{(j)}(k)}{j!} y^j - p_1(y)$, such that $g_1(z) = p_1(z - k) + r_1(z - k) + \delta_1$. It remains to establish the claimed properties of r_1 and δ_1 .

Before we proceed, we first take a closer look at the j -th derivative of g_1 , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} g_1^{(j)}(z) &= \left(-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2}\right)^j \frac{d - [p + k + 1]}{d} \dots \frac{d - [p + k + 1 + 2(j-1)]}{d} \\ &\quad \times \left(1 - \frac{\|x\|^2}{d}z\right)^{(d - [p + k + 1 + 2j])/2} e^{\frac{k}{2}\|x\|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In this display and for $j = 1, \dots, k+1$, note that $0 < d - [p + k + 1 + 2(i-1)] < d$ for each $i = 0, \dots, j+1$, because $d > 4(p + k + 1) > (p + k + 1) + 2(k+1)$.

To deal with the remainder term δ_1 , fix $z \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|z - k| < 1$ and note that this entails $0 \leq \|x\|^2 \zeta / d < M^2(k+1)/d < 1/4$ by assumption. We

therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|\delta_1|}{|z-k|^{k+1}} &= \left| \frac{(-\|x\|^2/2)^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} \right| \left| \frac{g_1^{(k+1)}(\zeta)}{(-\|x\|^2/2)^{k+1}} \right| \\
&\leq \frac{(M^2/2)^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} \left(1 - \frac{\|x\|^2}{d} \zeta \right)^{(d-p-3k-3)/2} e^{\frac{k}{2}\|x\|^2} \\
&\leq \frac{M^{2(k+1)}}{2^{k+1}(k+1)!} e^{\frac{k}{2}M^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the formula for $g_1^{(k+1)}$ just derived, and where the second inequality easily follows from our assumptions on d . In particular, the remainder term δ_1 has the desired properties.

To deal with r_1 , we first obtain convenient upper and lower bounds on $g_1^{(j)}(k)/(-\|x\|^2/2)^j$ for $j = 0, \dots, k$. Note that Lemma D.1 in Leeb (2013b) applies with $t = k\|x\|^2/d$, because our assumptions entail that $d > kM^2 \geq k\|x\|^2$ and hence $0 \leq k\|x\|^2/d < 1$. This lemma yields

$$\left(1 - \frac{k\|x\|^2}{d} \right)^{k\|x\|^2/2} \leq e^{k\|x\|^2/2} \left(1 - \frac{k\|x\|^2}{d} \right)^{d/2} \leq 1. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Note that due to concavity of the logarithm, we have for $z \in (-1, 0)$ and $y \in [z, 0]$, that $\log(1+y) \geq y \log(1+z)/z$, i.e., on $(z, 0)$ the graph of the function $y \mapsto \log(1+y)$ lies above the line segment connecting $(z, \log(1+z))$ with the origin. Applying this inequality twice, the first time with $z = -1/4$ and $y = -kM^2/d$, and the second time with $z = -3/4$ and $y = -(p+3k-1)/d$, we get

$$0 > \log \left(1 - \frac{kM^2}{d} \right) \geq \frac{4kM^2}{d} \log \left(\frac{3}{4} \right) \geq -\frac{4}{3} \frac{kM^2}{d}, \text{ and} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

$$0 > \log \left(1 - \frac{p+3k-1}{d} \right) \geq \frac{4(p+3k-1)}{3d} \log \left(\frac{1}{4} \right) \geq -2 \frac{p+3k-1}{d}. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

With this we can bound the quantity $g_1^{(j)}(k)/(-\|x\|^2/2)^j$ in the j -th coefficient of r_1 with $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$, from above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{g_1^{(j)}(k)}{(-\|x\|^2/2)^j} &\leq \left(1 - \frac{k\|x\|^2}{d} \right)^{-(p+k+1+2j)/2} \leq \left(1 - \frac{kM^2}{d} \right)^{-(p+3k+1)} \\
&= \exp \left[-(p+3k+1) \log \left(1 - \frac{kM^2}{d} \right) \right] \leq \exp \left[(p+3k+1) \frac{4}{3} \frac{kM^2}{d} \right] \\
&\leq \exp \left[\frac{pM^2}{d} \gamma_1(k) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $\gamma_1(k) > 0$. In this display, the first inequality follows because, in the formula for $g_1^{(j)}(z)$, the product of fractions is bounded by one, and

in view of (D.1); the second inequality and the first equality are trivial; the third inequality follows from (D.2); and the last inequality holds by setting, say, $\gamma_1(k) = 4k(2+3k)/3$. And we can also bound $g_1^{(j)}(k)/(-\|x\|^2/2)^j$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$ from below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{g_1^{(j)}(k)}{(-\|x\|^2/2)^j} &\geq \left(\frac{d - [p + k + 1 + 2(j-1)]}{d} \right)^j \left(1 - \frac{k\|x\|^2}{d} \right)^{k\|x\|^2/2} \\
&\geq \left(1 - \frac{p+3k-1}{d} \right)^k \left(1 - \frac{kM^2}{d} \right)^{kM^2/2} \\
&= \exp \left[k \log \left(1 - \frac{p+3k-1}{d} \right) + \frac{kM^2}{2} \log \left(1 - \frac{kM^2}{d} \right) \right] \\
&\geq \exp \left[-k2 \frac{p+3k-1}{d} - \frac{kM^2}{2} \frac{4}{3} \frac{kM^2}{d} \right] \\
&\geq \exp \left[-\frac{pM^4}{d} \gamma_2(k) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\gamma_2(k) > 0$. Here, the first inequality follows from the formula for $g_1^{(j)}(z)$ derived earlier and from (D.1); the second inequality holds because $j \leq k$ and because $\|x\| \leq M$; the equality is trivial; the third inequality is obtained from (D.2) and (D.3); and the last inequality holds for, say, $\gamma_2(k) = (6 + 2/3)k^2$.

For r_1 , we note that $r_1(y)$ is a polynomial of degree k in y , i.e., $r_1(y) = \sum_{j=0}^k \rho_j y^j$, where the j -th coefficient satisfies

$$|\rho_j| = \left| \frac{g_1^{(j)}(k)}{j!} - \frac{(-\|x\|^2/2)^j}{j!} \right| \leq \frac{(M^2/2)^j}{j!} \left| \frac{g_1^{(j)}(k)}{(-\|x\|^2/2)^j} - 1 \right|.$$

Setting $\gamma(k) = \max\{\gamma_1(k), \gamma_2(k)\}$, we thus get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\rho_j| &\leq M^{2k} \max \left\{ 1 - \exp \left[-\frac{pM^4}{d} \gamma(k) \right], \exp \left[\frac{pM^4}{d} \gamma(k) \right] - 1 \right\} \\
&= M^{2k} \left(\exp \left[\frac{pM^4}{d} \gamma(k) \right] - 1 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{pM^{2(k+2)}}{d} \left(e^{\gamma(k)} - 1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

for $j = 0, \dots, k$. In this display, the first inequality follows from the formula for $|\rho_j|$, and from the upper and lower bounds on $g_1^{(j)}(k)/(-\|x\|^2/2)^j$ derived earlier; the equality is trivial; and the last inequality follows because $\gamma(k) > 0$ and $pM^4/d \in (0, 1)$ and because $e^{cy} - 1 \leq (e^c - 1)y$ for $c \geq 0$ and $y \in (0, 1)$ by the convexity of the exponential. Setting $c_1(k) = e^{\gamma(k)} - 1$, we see that r_1 has the desired properties. $\square$

Lemma D.2. *Let k and p be positive integers and consider the function $g_2(z) = z^{-p/2}$ for $z > 0$. Then g_2 can be expanded as*

$$g_2(z) = p_2(z-1) + \delta_2,$$

where $p_2(y) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \left[\frac{(-1/2)^j}{j!} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} (p+2i) \right] y^j$ is a polynomial of degree k whose j -th coefficient can be bounded in absolute value by p^j , and where the remainder term δ_2 satisfies

$$\sup_{z: |z-1| < \frac{1}{2p}} \frac{|\delta_2|}{|z-1|^{k+1}} \leq p^{k+1} d_2$$

with $d_2 = d_2(k)$ depending only on k .

Proof. A k -th order Taylor expansion of g_2 around one shows that $g_2(z)$ can be written as $p_2(z-1) + \delta_2$, where p_2 is as claimed, and where δ_2 is the remainder term. It is now elementary to verify that the coefficients of p_2 are bounded as claimed. The remainder term δ_2 is given by $g_2^{(k+1)}(\zeta)(z-1)^{k+1}/(k+1)!$ for some ζ between z and 1. For z such that $|z-1| < 1/(2p)$, we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\delta_2|}{|z-1|^{k+1}} &= \zeta^{-p/2-(k+1)} \frac{(1/2)^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} \prod_{i=0}^k (p+2i) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2p}\right)^{-p/2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2p}\right)^{-(k+1)} p^{k+1} \leq (2e)^{1/4} 2^{k+1} p^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by using Lemma D.1 in Leeb (2013b) with $t = 1/(2p)$ to obtain that $(1 - 1/(2p))^{-p/2} \leq (2e)^{1/4}$. Setting $d_2 = (2e)^{1/4} 2^{k+1}$ completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma D.3. *Fix $M > 1$, positive integers k and p , and $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $\|x\| \leq M$. Choose $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d > 4(k+p+1)M^4$, and define $g_1(\cdot)$ as in Lemma D.1. Take d -vectors $w_1, \dots, w_k$ so that the $k \times k$ matrix $S_k = (w_i' w_j / d)_{i,j=1}^k$ satisfies $\|S_k - I_k\| < 1/(2k)$. We then have*

$$g_1(\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota) = p_1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \iota' (I_k - S_k)^j \iota \right) + r_1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \iota' (I_k - S_k)^j \iota \right) + \Delta_1,$$

where the polynomials $p_1(\cdot)$ and $r_1(\cdot)$ are as in Lemma D.1, and where the remainder term Δ_1 satisfies

$$|\Delta_1| \leq D_1 \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1} M^{2(k+2)} e^{\frac{k}{2} M^2}$$

for some constant $D_1 = D_1(k)$ that depends only on k .

Proof. Set $z = \iota' S_k^{-1} \iota$, and note that $g_1(z)$ is well-defined because $z\|x\|^2/d < 1$. [Indeed, all eigenvalues of S_k are strictly between $1/2$ and $3/2$ by assumption, so that $\|S_k^{-1}\| < 2$ and $\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota < 2k$; our assumptions on d and x give $z\|x\|^2/d < 1$.] It is now easy to see that Lemma D.1 applies, so that we can write $g_1(z)$ as

$$g_1(\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota) = p_1(\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota - k) + r_1(\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota - k) + \delta_1,$$

such that δ_1 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta_1| &\leq \frac{M^{2(k+1)}}{2^{k+1}(k+1)!} e^{\frac{k}{2}M^2} |\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota - k|^{k+1} \\ &\leq \frac{M^{2(k+1)}}{2^{k+1}(k+1)!} e^{\frac{k}{2}M^2} (2k)^{k+1} \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequalities in the preceding display hold because $|\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota - k| = |\iota'(S_k^{-1} - I_k)\iota| \leq k\|S_k^{-1} - I_k\| = k\|S_k^{-1}(I_k - S_k)\| \leq k\|S_k^{-1}\| \|S_k - I_k\| < 2k\|S_k - I_k\| \leq 1$. For later use, we also note that the functions $p_1(\cdot)$ and $r_1(\cdot)$ in the second-to-last display are polynomials of degree k whose coefficients can be bounded, in absolute value, by $L(k, M) = M^{2(k+2)} \max\{1, c_1\}$, where $c_1 = c_1(k)$ is the constant from Lemma D.1 that depends only on k . [Indeed, the j -th coefficient of p_1 is given by $(-\|x\|^2/2)^j/j!$ and hence is bounded, in absolute value, by M^{2k} , and the coefficients of r_1 are bounded, in absolute value, by $\frac{pM^{2(k+2)}}{d}c_1 < c_1M^{2(k+2)}$.]

Now expand $\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota - k$ as in Corollary D.5(i) in Leeb (2013b) with k replacing m , i.e., as

$$\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota - k = \sum_{j=1}^k \iota'(I_k - S_k)^j \iota + r,$$

where the main term satisfies $|\sum_{j=1}^k \iota'(I_k - S_k)^j \iota| \leq 1$ by assumption and $|r| < 2k\|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1} \leq 1$. Moreover, recall that p_1 is a polynomial of degree k whose coefficients are bounded, in absolute value, by the constant $L = L(k, M)$ defined in the preceding paragraph. In view of these considerations, we see that Lemma D.6 of Leeb (2013b) applies, with 1 , p_1 , k , $L(k, M)$, 1 , and $2k\|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1}$ replacing m , ρ_1 , l , L , B , and ϵ . From that lemma, and from the last line of its proof, we obtain that

$$p_1(\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota - k) = p_1\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \iota'(I_k - S_k)^j \iota\right) + \delta_p$$

with $|\delta_p| < \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1} M^{2(k+2)} [2k(k+1 + 2^{k+1}) \max\{c_1, 1\}]$. In a similar fashion, we also obtain that

$$r_1(\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota - k) = r_1\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \iota'(I_k - S_k)^j \iota\right) + \delta_q$$

with $|\delta_q| < \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1} M^{2(k+2)} [2k(k+1+2^{k+1}) \max\{c_1, 1\}]$. In view of the preceding two paragraphs, we see that $g_1(\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota)$ can be expanded as claimed, with $\Delta_1 = \delta_1 + \delta_p + \delta_q$. $\square$

Lemma D.4. *Fix positive integers k, p and d such that $1 \leq k \leq d - p$. Then there exists a constant $\xi(k) > 2$ depending only on k for which the following holds true. For any collection of d -vectors $w_1, \dots, w_k$, for which the $k \times k$ -matrix $S_k = (w_i' w_j / d)_{i,j=1}^k$ satisfies $\|S_k - I_k\| < 1/(p \xi(k))$, the determinant $\det S_k^{-p/2}$ can be expanded as*

$$\det S_k^{-p/2} = Q_2(S_k - I_k) + \Delta_2,$$

where Q_2 and Δ_2 have the following properties: $Q_2(S_k - I_k)$ is a polynomial in the elements of $S_k - I_k$ whose degree depends only on k and whose coefficients are bounded in absolute value by $p^k C_2$, where $C_2 = C_2(k)$ is a constant that depends only on k . The remainder term Δ_2 satisfies

$$|\Delta_2| \leq D_2 p^{k+1} \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1}$$

for a constant $D_2 = D_2(k)$ that depends only on k .

Proof. We begin with a collection of d -vectors $w_1, \dots, w_k$ such that $\|S_k - I_k\| < 1/2$. First note that the determinant of S_k can be written as

$$\det S_k = \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{1}{d} \|(I_d - P_{N_{(i-1)}})w_i\|^2 \right),$$

where $P_{N_{(i-1)}}$ denotes the matrix of the orthogonal projection on the column space of $N_{(i-1)} = [w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}]$ in case $i > 1$ and is to be interpreted as the $d \times d$ zero matrix in case $i = 1$. [Recall the relation $\det([X, Y]'[X, Y]) = \det(X'X) \det(Y'(I - P_X)Y)$ for appropriate matrices X and Y , and use this recursively with $X = N_{(i-1)}$ and $Y = w_i$.] The first factor on the right hand side of the preceding display equals $w_1' w_1 / d$, while for $i > 1$ the factor corresponding to index i can be written as

$$\frac{w_i' w_i}{d} - \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{w_i' N_{(i-1)}}{d} \left(I_{i-1} - \frac{N_{(i-1)}' N_{(i-1)}}{d} \right)^j \frac{N_{(i-1)}' w_i}{d} + r_i$$

with $|r_i| < 2\|S_k - I_k\|^{k+3}$ in view of Corollary D.5(ii) in [Leeb \(2013b\)](#). Write $T_i(S_k - I_k)$ as shorthand for

$$1 + \left(\frac{w_i' w_i}{d} - 1 \right) - \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{w_i' N_{(i-1)}}{d} \left(I_{i-1} - \frac{N_{(i-1)}' N_{(i-1)}}{d} \right)^j \frac{N_{(i-1)}' w_i}{d}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$, where the sum is to be interpreted as zero in case $i = 1$. Note that $T_i(S_k - I_k)$ is a polynomial in the entries of $S_k - I_k$ of degree 1 in case $i = 1$

and of degree $k + 2$ in case $i > 1$, whose coefficients depend only on k . Clearly, the coefficient of the linear term $(w'_i w_i / d - 1)$ in $T_i(S_k - I_k)$ is one, and the coefficient of each higher order term originating from the j -th term in the sum is bounded, in absolute value, by a constant depending only on k . The coefficients of $T_i(S_k - I_k)$ thus are bounded, in absolute value, by a constant depending only on k . Also note that $|T_i(S_k - I_k)|$ is bounded by some constant, $B(k)$ say, that depends only on k . [Indeed, we have $|w'_i w_i / d - 1| = |e'_i(S_k - I_k)e_i| \leq \|S_k - I_k\| < 1/2$. And, in case $i > 1$, the absolute value of the j -th term in the sum in T_i can be bounded in a similar way by $\|N'_{(i-1)} N_{(i-1)} / d - I_{i-1}\|^j \|N'_{(i-1)} w_i / d\|^2 \leq \|S_k - I_k\|^j \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} (e'_l(S_k - I_k)e_l)^2 \leq (i-1)\|S_k - I_k\|^{j+2} \leq k\|S_k - I_k\|^{j+2} < k/4$. We may thus choose $B(k) = 1 + 1/2 + k(k+1)/4$.] With this we can write the determinant of S_k as

$$\det S_k = \prod_{i=1}^k [T_i(S_k - I_k) + r_i].$$

We now apply Lemma D.6 in Leeb (2013b) with $m = k$, ρ_i equal to the identity function, $x_i = T_i(S_k - I_k)$, $u_i = r_i$, $l = L = 1$, $B = B(k)$ and $\epsilon = 2\|S_k - I_k\|^{k+3}$. From that lemma, and from the last line of its proof, we see that

$$\det S_k = \prod_{i=1}^k T_i(S_k - I_k) + r,$$

where r satisfies $|r| < \kappa(k)\|S_k - I_k\|^{k+3}$ for $\kappa(k) = 2^{k+1}3^k B(k)^{k-1}$. For later use, note that $\prod_{i=1}^k T_i(S_k - I_k)$ is a polynomial in $S_k - I_k$ whose degree depends only on k , and whose coefficients are bounded in absolute value by a constant depending only on k . Expanding the product in the preceding display, we get

$$\det S_k = 1 + \text{trace}(S_k - I_k) + R(S_k - I_k) + r,$$

where $R(S_k - I_k)$ is a polynomial in the elements of $S_k - I_k$ whose degree and coefficients depend only on k and that contains no constant or linear term. Note that $|\text{trace}(S_k - I_k) + R(S_k - I_k)| \leq C(k)\|S_k - I_k\|$ for some constant $C(k)$ depending only on k , e.g., $C(k) = (1 + k^2)^k$. [Bounding the terms of $T_i(S_k - I_k)$ as in the preceding discussion, we see that $|1 - T_i(S_k - I_k)| \leq (1 + (k+1)(k-1))\|S_k - I_k\| = k^2\|S_k - I_k\|$. By this, it is easy to see that $|\prod_{i=1}^k T_i - 1|$, is bounded by $(1 + k^2)^k\|S_k - I_k\|$.]

Next we define the constant ξ by $\xi(k) = 2[C(k) + \kappa(k)]$, note that $\xi(k) > 2$, and take d -vectors $w_1, \dots, w_k$ such that $\|S_k - I_k\| < 1/(p\xi(k))$. Note that for this new collection of vectors everything we have shown so far still holds true since $\|S_k - I_k\| < 1/(p\xi(k)) < 1/2$. To finish the proof we now evaluate $z^{-p/2}$ for $z = \det S_k$ (which is well-defined because S_k is positive definite by assumption). Now $|z - 1| \leq |\text{trace}(S_k - I_k) + R(S_k - I_k)| + |r| \leq [C(k) + \kappa(k)]\|S_k - I_k\| < 1/(2p)$. Hence Lemma D.2 entails that

$$\det S_k^{-p/2} = p_2 \left(\text{trace}(S_k - I_k) + R(S_k - I_k) + r \right) + \delta_2$$

with $|\delta_2| \leq d_2(k)p^{k+1}|z-1|^{k+1} \leq d_2(k)(\xi(k)/2)^{k+1}p^{k+1}\|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1}$. Abbreviate the coefficients of p_2 by ρ_j for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and set $t = \text{trace}(S_k - I_k)$. Then we can evaluate the polynomial in the preceding display as

$$\begin{aligned}
p_2(t + R(S_k - I_k) + r) &= 1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \rho_j (t + R(S_k - I_k) + r)^j \\
&= 1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \rho_j \left(\sum_{i=0}^j \binom{j}{i} (t + R(S_k - I_k))^i r^{j-i} \right) \\
&= 1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \rho_j (t + R(S_k - I_k))^j + \sum_{j=1}^k \rho_j \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \binom{j}{i} (t + R(S_k - I_k))^i r^{j-i} \right) \\
&= p_2(t + R(S_k - I_k)) + \tilde{r},
\end{aligned}$$

where the remainder term $\tilde{r}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{r}| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k p^j \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \binom{j}{i} C(k)^i \kappa(k)^{j-i} \|S_k - I_k\|^{(j-i)(k+3)+i} \\
&\leq p^{k+1} \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+3} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \binom{j}{i} C(k)^i \kappa(k)^{j-i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now set $Q_2(S_k - I_k) = p_2(\text{trace}(S_k - I_k) + R(S_k - I_k))$ and set $\Delta_2 = \tilde{r} + \delta_2$. By the discussion in the preceding paragraph and by Lemma D.2, we see that $Q_2(S_k - I_k)$ is a polynomial in $S_k - I_k$ whose degree depends only on k , and whose coefficients are bounded in absolute value by $p^k C_2(k)$ for some constant $C_2(k)$ that depends only on k . The bound on $|\delta_2|$ derived earlier and the bound in $|\tilde{r}|$ in the preceding display entail that $|\Delta_2| \leq D_2(k)p^{k+1}\|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1}$ for $D_2(k)$ depending only on k . $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Any expansion is trivially correct unless we specify some properties of the remainder term. So choose the constant $\xi(k)$ equal to $\xi(k) = \xi'(k) + 2k > 2k$, where $\xi'(k)$ is the constant ξ given by Lemma D.4. Now take a collection of d -vectors $w_1, \dots, w_k$ such that $\|S_k - I_k\| < 1/(p\xi(k))$ and note that this also permits the determinant expansion given by Lemma D.4 with the error term as described there. Note that $\|S_k - I_k\| < 1/(2p) \leq 1/2$ and thus all eigenvalues of S_k are strictly between $1/2$ and $3/2$. Therefore the largest eigenvalue of S_k^{-1} , i.e., $\|S_k^{-1}\|$, is less than 2. We conclude that $\|x\|^2 \iota' S_k^{-1} \iota / d \leq M^2 k \|S_k^{-1}\| / d \leq 2kM^2 / d < 1$ by assumption. In view of Proposition 3.2, we thus can write the density ratio of interest as

$$\frac{\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k)}{\phi(w_1) \cdots \phi(w_k)} = \eta(d, p, k) \gamma_1(S_k) \gamma_2(S_k),$$

for $\eta(d, p, k)$ as in Proposition 3.2, for

$$\gamma_1(S_k) = \left(1 - \frac{\|x\|^2}{d} \iota' S_k^{-1} \iota\right)^{(d-p-k-1)/2} e^{\frac{k}{2}\|x\|^2},$$

and for $\gamma_2(S_k) = \det(S_k)^{-p/2}$. Recall that $\eta(d, p, k)$ is bounded as described by Proposition 3.2, and hence it is also bounded by $\exp(2p^2k^2/(3d)) \leq \exp(2k^2/3)$, because our assumptions on d, p and k entail that $(1 - \frac{p+k-1}{d})^{-1} \leq 4/3$ and $p^2/d < 1$.

Note that we have $\gamma_1(S_k) = g_1(\iota' S_k^{-1} \iota)$ for g_1 as in Lemma D.1. And since $\|S_k - I_k\| < 1/(p\xi(k)) < 1/(2k)$, Lemma D.3 entails that

$$\gamma_1(S_k) = p_1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \iota'(I_k - S_k)^j \iota \right) + r_1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \iota'(I_k - S_k)^j \iota \right) + \Delta_1,$$

where Δ_1 satisfies $|\Delta_1| \leq D_1(k) \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1} M^{2(k+2)} e^{\frac{k}{2}M^2}$. Using the properties of p_1 and r_1 as given by Lemma D.1 we can rewrite this as

$$\gamma_1(S_k) = Q_1(S_k - I_k) + \Delta_1.$$

where $Q_1(S_k - I_k)$ is a polynomial in the elements of $S_k - I_k$ whose degree depends only on k and whose coefficients are bounded in absolute value by $M^{2(k+2)}C_{Q_1}$ for a constant $C_{Q_1} = C_{Q_1}(k)$ that depends only on k .

As already mentioned at the beginning of the proof, also Lemma D.4 applies and entails that

$$\gamma_2(S_k) = Q_2(S_k - I_k) + \Delta_2,$$

where $Q_2(S_k - I_k)$ is a polynomial in the elements of $S_k - I_k$ whose degree depends only on k and whose coefficients are bounded in absolute value by $p^k C_{Q_2}$ where $C_{Q_2} = C_{Q_2}(k)$ is a constant that depends only on k , and where the remainder term Δ_2 satisfies

$$|\Delta_2| \leq D_2 p^{k+1} \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1}$$

for a constant $D_2 = D_2(k)$ that depends only on k .

Now expanding the product of $\gamma_1(S_k)$ and $\gamma_2(S_k)$ yields a sum of 4 terms. Denote the product of the two polynomials Q_1 and Q_2 by $\tilde{\psi}_x(S_k - I_k) = Q_1(S_k - I_k)Q_2(S_k - I_k)$ and note that this is a polynomial in the elements of $S_k - I_k$ whose degree depends only on k and whose coefficients are bounded by $p^k M^{2(k+2)}\tilde{C}$, where $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(k)$ is a constant that depends only on k . Moreover, denote the sum of the three remaining terms by $\tilde{\Delta} = \tilde{\Delta}(S_k - I_k)$ and note that it satisfies $|\tilde{\Delta}| \leq p^{k+1} M^{2(k+2)} e^{kM^2/2} \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1} \tilde{D}$, where $\tilde{D} = \tilde{D}(k)$ is a constant that depends only on k . All together, we have obtained that

$$\frac{\varphi_x(w_1, \dots, w_k)}{\phi(w_1) \cdots \phi(w_k)} = \tilde{\psi}_x(S_k - I_k) + \tilde{\Delta},$$

where $\eta(d, p, k)$ has been incorporated into the coefficients of $\tilde{\psi}_x$ and the remainder term $\tilde{\Delta}$ without affecting their boundedness properties. Now it is no loss of generality to assume that the degree of $\tilde{\psi}_x$ is no more than k , since all the terms which are of order $k+1$ or higher, can simply be added to the remainder term $\tilde{\Delta}$ without affecting its boundedness property (only the constant $\tilde{D}$ needs adjustment), because $\|S_k - I_k\| < 1$ and thus $\|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1+l} \leq \|S_k - I_k\|^{k+1}$, for all $l \geq 0$.

The quantities $\tilde{\psi}_x(S_k - I_k)$ and $\tilde{\Delta}$ discussed in the preceding paragraph have all the properties that we need to derive for $\psi_x(S_k - I_k)$ and Δ , respectively, except for permutation invariance. But the expression on the left-hand side of the preceding display is invariant under permutations of the w_i 's in view of Proposition 3.2. Set $\psi_x(S_k - I_k)$ and Δ equal to the average of $\tilde{\psi}_x(S_k - I_k)$ and $\tilde{\Delta}$, respectively, taken over all permutations of the w_i 's. Clearly, the relation in the preceding display continues to hold with $\psi_x(S_k - I_k)$ and Δ replacing $\tilde{\psi}_x(S_k - I_k)$ and $\tilde{\Delta}$, respectively, and $\psi_x(S_k - I_k)$ and Δ have all the required properties, including permutation invariance. $\square$

Lemma D.5. *Let d, p and k be positive integers and suppose that $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$ are i.i.d. random d -vectors that satisfy the bound (b2) with k as chosen here. If $\zeta > 0$ and $d > \max\{2k + 4p\zeta, p^2\}$, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{d}{\|(I_d - P_{Z_1, \dots, Z_{k-1}})Z_k\|^2} \right)^{p\zeta} \right] \leq C(4\pi e D^2)^{p\zeta},$$

where $C = C(k, \zeta)$ depends only on k and ζ and where D is the constant from (b2).

Proof. Write R_d as shorthand for $R_d = \|(I_d - P_{Z_1, \dots, Z_{k-1}})Z_k\|^2/d$, and take $L > 0$ to be chosen later. The expectation in question can be calculated as

$$\mathbb{E} [R_d^{-p\zeta}] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(R_d^{-p\zeta} > t) dt \leq L + \int_L^\infty \mathbb{P}(R_d < t^{-\frac{1}{p\zeta}}) dt.$$

Now use the exact same argument as in the proof of Proposition E.1 in Leeb (2013b) (with $p\zeta$ replacing α in that reference), which involves (b2) (or, equivalently, condition (t2) in that reference), to bound the integral on the far right-hand-side of the previous display by

$$L \frac{2p\zeta}{d - k + 1 - 2p\zeta} \left(\frac{D^2 \pi d}{L^{\frac{1}{p\zeta}}} \right)^{\frac{d-k+1}{2}} \frac{d^{\frac{k-1}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d-k+3}{2}\right)}.$$

By Theorem 1 of Kečkić and Vasić (1971) with $x \geq 2$ and with $y = 2$, we obtain that $\Gamma(x) \geq x^{x-1} \exp(2-x)/2 > x^{x-1} \exp(-x)/2$. Using this to lower-bound the gamma-function in the preceding display, it is elementary to verify that

$$\mathbb{E} [R_d^{-p\zeta}] \leq L + L^{1-\frac{d-k+1}{2p\zeta}} 4p\zeta \left(2D^2 \pi e \frac{d}{d-k+3} \right)^{\frac{d-k+1}{2}} d^{\frac{k-1}{2}} e. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Write K to abbreviate the factor in (D.4) starting with $4p\zeta \dots$, ending with $\dots e$, and note that it does not depend on L . Also note that the upper bound in (D.4) is a convex function in L that is minimized at

$$L_0 = \left(\frac{d-k+1}{2p\zeta} - 1 \right)^{\frac{2p\zeta}{d-k+1}} K^{\frac{2p\zeta}{d-k+1}}.$$

Plugging this back into (D.4) yields the optimized bound

$$L_0 + L_0 \left(\frac{d-k+1}{2p\zeta} - 1 \right)^{-1} < 2L_0.$$

It remains to show that $2L_0$ is of the form $C(k, \zeta)(4\pi e D^2)^{p\zeta}$ as claimed. But this follows immediately upon writing out the formula for $2L_0$ and noting that $\frac{d}{d-k+3} \leq 2$, that $2p\zeta/(d-k+1) < 1/2$, and that the following quantities are all bounded by a constant that depends only on k and ζ :

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{d-k+1}{2p\zeta} - 1 \right)^{\frac{2p\zeta}{d-k+1}} &= \exp \left(\frac{2p\zeta}{d-k+1} \log \left(\frac{d-k+1}{2p\zeta} - 1 \right) \right) \leq e, \\ (4p\zeta)^{\frac{2p\zeta}{d-k+1}} &= \exp \left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{d}} \frac{\log(p) + \log(4\zeta)}{\sqrt{d}} \frac{2\zeta}{1-k/d+1/d} \right), \\ d^{\frac{(k-1)p\zeta}{d-k+1}} &= \exp \left(\frac{(k-1)\zeta}{1-k/d+1/d} \frac{p}{d} \log d \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(2(k-1)\zeta \frac{p}{\sqrt{d}} \frac{\log d}{\sqrt{d}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Set $h = \deg(H)$ and fix $x \in \mathcal{S}_{M,p}$. It suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[d^{\frac{h+l}{2}} \|S_l - I_l\|^h \left| \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_l)}{\phi(Z_1) \dots \phi(Z_l)} - \psi_x(S_l - I_l) \right| \right]$$

is bounded as claimed. Note that Proposition 3.3 applies with l replacing k . Write U_d for the integrand in the preceding display and note that $\mathbb{E}[U_d]$ can also be written as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[U_d \left\{ \|S_l - I_l\| < \frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right\} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[U_d \left\{ \|S_l - I_l\| \geq \frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right\} \right], \quad (\text{D.5})$$

where $\xi(l) > 2l$ is the constant from Proposition 3.3. We will show that both terms in (D.5) can be bounded appropriately.

For the first term in (D.5), we use Proposition 3.3 to conclude that $U_d\{\|S_l - I_l\| < 1/(p\xi(l))\}$ is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} &C_\Delta d^{(h+l)/2} p^{l+1} M^{2(l+2)} e^{\frac{1}{2}M^2} \|S_l - I_l\|^{h+l+1} \\ &\leq C_\Delta p^{k+1} M^{2(k+2)} e^{\frac{k}{2}M^2} d^{-1/2} \|\sqrt{d}(S_l - I_l)\|^{h+l+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where C_Δ is a constant that depends only on k . Note that $\mathbb{E}[\|\sqrt{d}(S_l - I_l)\|^{h+l+1}]$ is bounded by the constant α from (b1).(a) in view of Lyapunov's inequality.

The second term in (D.5) can further be bounded from above by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[d^{\frac{h+l}{2}} \|S_l - I_l\|^h |\psi_x(S_l - I_l)| \left\{ \|S_l - I_l\| \geq \frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right\} \right] \quad (\text{D.6})$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[d^{\frac{h+l}{2}} \|S_l - I_l\|^h \left| \frac{\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_l)}{\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_l)} \right| \left\{ \|S_l - I_l\| \geq \frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right\} \right]. \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Concerning (D.6), recall that $l \leq k$ and that $\psi_x(S_l - I_l)$ is a polynomial of degree l in the entries of $S_l - I_l$ whose coefficients are bounded by $p^k M^{2(k+2)}$ times a constant $C_\psi = C_\psi(k)$ that depends only on k (cf. Proposition 3.3). Therefore, (D.6) can be bounded by

$$p^k M^{2(k+2)} d^{\frac{h+l}{2}} \sum_{\ell=0}^l \mathbb{E} \left[\|S_l - I_l\|^{h+\ell} \left\{ \|S_l - I_l\| \geq \frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right\} \right]$$

times a constant that depends only on k (C_ψ times some factor bounding the number of different monomials in $\psi_x(S_l - I_l)$). Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_l - I_l\|^{h+l+1} &\geq \|S_l - I_l\|^{h+\ell} \|S_l - I_l\|^{l-\ell+1} \left\{ \|S_l - I_l\| \geq \frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right\} \\ &\geq \|S_l - I_l\|^{h+\ell} \left(\frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right)^{l-\ell+1} \left\{ \|S_l - I_l\| \geq \frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and use this to further bound the expression in the second to last display by

$$\begin{aligned} M^{2(k+2)} \sum_{\ell=0}^l \xi(l)^{k-\ell+1} p^{k+l-\ell+1} d^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\sqrt{d}(S_l - I_l)\|^{h+l+1} \right] \\ \leq (k+1) \xi(l)^{k+1} p^{2k+1} M^{2(k+2)} d^{-1/2} \alpha \end{aligned}$$

where, again, we have bounded $\mathbb{E}[\|\sqrt{d}(S_l - I_l)\|^{h+l+1}]$ by the constant $\alpha \geq 1$ from (b1).(a) using Lyapunov's inequality.

To deal with (D.7), we first note that $\varphi_x(Z_1, \dots, Z_l)/(\phi(Z_1) \cdots \phi(Z_l))$ is bounded by $\eta \det S_l^{-p/2} \exp(lM^2/2)$, in view of Proposition 3.2, where $0 \leq \eta \leq e^{2l^2/3}$ holds because, under our present assumptions, $p^2(1 - (p+l-1)/d)^{-1}/d \leq 4/3$. Using Hölder's inequality with $a > 1$ and b such that $\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} = 1$, an upper bound for (D.7) is given by

$$e^{\frac{2k^2}{3} + \frac{kM^2}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\det S_l^{-\frac{bp}{2}} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{b}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[d^{\frac{a(h+l)}{2}} \|S_l - I_l\|^{ah} \left\{ \|S_l - I_l\| \geq \frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right\} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{a}}. \quad (\text{D.8})$$

For $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/2]$ as in (b1).(a), fix $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ and use a similar argument as in the preceding paragraph to obtain

$$\|S_l - I_l\|^h \left\{ \|S_l - I_l\| \geq \frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right\} \leq (p\xi(l))^{l+\varepsilon+\delta} \|S_l - I_l\|^{h+l+\varepsilon+\delta}.$$

With this, and by choosing $a = \frac{h+l+\varepsilon+2\delta}{h+l+\varepsilon+\delta} > 1$, we can bound the last factor in (D.8) with the $1/a$ exponent as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\mathbb{E} \left[d^{\frac{a(h+l)}{2}} \|S_l - I_l\|^{ah} \left\{ \|S_l - I_l\| \geq \frac{1}{p\xi(l)} \right\} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \\ & \leq (p\xi(l))^{l+\varepsilon+\delta} d^{-\frac{\varepsilon+\delta}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\|\sqrt{d}(S_l - I_l)\|^{a(h+l+\varepsilon+\delta)} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \\ & \leq (p\xi(l))^{k+\varepsilon+\delta} d^{-\frac{\varepsilon+\delta}{2}} \max \left\{ 1, \mathbb{E} \left[\|\sqrt{d}(S_k - I_k)\|^{(h+k+\varepsilon+2\delta)} \right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last expression in parentheses is, again, bounded by $\alpha \geq 1$ in view of (b1).(a). At the end of the proof we will see that it is optimal to choose $\delta = 1/2$. It remains to control the factor $(\mathbb{E} \det S_l^{-bp/2})^{1/b}$ in (D.8). First, in view of Lyapunov's inequality, increasing $b = a/(a-1) = (h+l+\varepsilon+2\delta)/\delta$ to $\tilde{b} = (2k+2\delta+1)/\delta$ only increases this term. We can therefore work with $\tilde{b}$ instead, which, after fixing δ , depends only on k . Next, decompose $\det S_l$ as $\det S_l = \prod_{i=1}^l (|(I_d - P_{Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}})Z_i|^2/d)$ (cf. the beginning of the proof of Proposition D.4), and set

$$X_i = \left(\frac{d}{\|(I_d - P_{Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}})Z_i\|^2} \right)^{\tilde{b}p}$$

to obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} \det S_l^{-\tilde{b}p} = \mathbb{E} \prod_{i=1}^l X_i \leq \prod_{i=1}^l \left(\mathbb{E} X_i^{2^i} \right)^{\frac{1}{2^i}}$$

upon repeatedly using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Now the expectation in the i -th factor on the far right-hand-side of the preceding display is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} X_i^{2^i} &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d}{\|(I_d - P_{Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}})Z_i\|^2} \right)^{p\tilde{b}2^i} = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d}{\|(I_d - P_{Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}})Z_k\|^2} \right)^{p\tilde{b}2^i} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d}{\|(I_d - P_{Z_1, \dots, Z_{k-1}})Z_k\|^2} \right)^{p\tilde{b}2^i} \leq C(k, \tilde{b}2^i) (4\pi e D^2)^{p\tilde{b}2^i}, \end{aligned}$$

provided that $d > \max\{2k + 4p\tilde{b}2^i, p^2\}$ in view of Lemma D.5. Since $\tilde{b} = (2k + 2\delta + 1)/\delta$, this will certainly hold for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, if $d > 2k + 2^{k+2}p(2k + 2\delta + 1)/\delta$. This lower bound is minimized over $(0, 1/2]$ for $\delta = 1/2$, leading to

the requirement that $d > 2k + p(2k + 2)2^{k+3}$, which holds by assumption. We therefore have

$$\mathbb{E} \det S_l^{-\tilde{b}p} \leq \prod_{i=1}^l \left(C(k, \tilde{b}2^i)^{1/2^i} (4\pi e D^2)^{p\tilde{b}} \right) = (4\pi e D^2)^{p\tilde{b}l} \prod_{i=1}^l C(k, \tilde{b}2^i)^{1/2^i}.$$

and hence

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\det S_l^{-\tilde{b}p/2} \right] \right)^{1/\tilde{b}} \leq (2D\sqrt{\pi e})^{pk} \prod_{i=1}^l C(k, \tilde{b}2^i)^{\frac{1}{\tilde{b}2^i+1}}$$

because $\mathbb{E}[\det S_l^{-\tilde{b}p/2}] \leq (\mathbb{E}[\det S_l^{-\tilde{b}p}])^{1/2}$. After putting the pieces together, it is now elementary to verify that the resulting upper bound for (D.8) has the desired properties. $\square$

Appendix E: Proofs for Section 3.6

Lemma E.1. *For positive integers $p < d$ and a positive even integer k such that $k \leq d - p$, let $V_1, \dots, V_k$ be i.i.d. standard Gaussian d -vectors. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, let φ_x denote the density given by Proposition 3.2. Then the expressions*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^m V'_{j_{i-1}+1} V_{j_{i-1}+2} \cdots V'_{j_{i-1}} V_{j_i} \right) \frac{\varphi_x(V_1, \dots, V_l)}{\phi(V_1) \cdots \phi(V_l)} \right] - \|x\|^{2(j_m-m)}$$

are all equal to zero, for each $l = 1, \dots, k$, for each $m \geq 0$ and for each set of indices $j_0, \dots, j_m$ that satisfies $j_0 = 0$, $j_m \leq l$ and $j_{i-1} + 1 < j_i$ whenever $0 < i \leq m$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left[(V'_1 V_2 \cdots V_j V'_j V_1 - d + p - 1) \frac{\varphi_x(V_1, \dots, V_k)}{\phi(V_1) \cdots \phi(V_k)} \right] - (1 - \|x\|^2)^k$$

also equals zero.

Proof. Let $W_1, \dots, W_k$ be defined by (3.5) with $\mathbf{B}$ uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{V}_{d,p}$ and note that the W_i 's are conditionally independent given $\mathbf{B}$, $\mathbb{E}[W_i \|\mathbf{B}\|] = \mathbf{B}x$ and $\mathbb{E}[W_i W'_i \|\mathbf{B}\|] = \mathbf{B}x x' \mathbf{B}' + (I_d - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}')$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

For the first statement, note that if $m = 0$ then also $j_m = j_0 = 0$ and so we have $1 - 1 = 0$, because φ_x is a density w.r.t. Lebesgue measure and hence

integrates to one. In case $m > 0$, we may write the expected value of interest as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m W'_{j_{i-1}+1} W_{j_{i-1}+2} \cdots W'_{j_i-1} W_{j_i} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[W'_{j_{i-1}+1} W_{j_{i-1}+2} W'_{j_i-1} W_{j_i} \middle| \mathbf{B} \right] \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{i=1}^m x' \mathbf{B}' \left[(\mathbf{B} x x' \mathbf{B}')^{j_i - j_{i-1} - 2} + (I_d - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}') \right] \mathbf{B} x \right) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^m \|x\|^{2(j_i - j_{i-1} - 1)} = \|x\|^{2(j_m - m)}
\end{aligned}$$

in view of Proposition 3.2 and (3.5), where we have used the convention that $A^0 = I_d$ for a $d \times d$ matrix A .

For the second statement, each expected value in the sum can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[(W'_1 W_2 \cdots W_j W'_j W_1 - d + p - 1) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\text{trace } W_1 W'_1 W_2 \cdots W_j W'_j \middle| \mathbf{B} \right] \right) - d + p - 1 \\
&= \|x\|^{2j} + \mathbb{E} (\text{trace}(I_d - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}')) - d + p - 1 = \|x\|^{2j} - 1
\end{aligned}$$

again in view of Proposition 3.2 and (3.5). For $j = 0$ the above expression is equal to zero, so we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} (\|x\|^{2j} - 1) &= \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} (\|x\|^{2j} - 1) \\
&= (\|x\|^2 - 1)^k = (1 - \|x\|^2)^k
\end{aligned}$$

since k is even. $\square$

Define S_k as in Section 2, and let G be a monomial of degree g in the elements of $S_k - I_k$. We note that G corresponds to a graph with g edges, where each divisor of G of the form $(S_k - I_k)_{i,j}$ corresponds to an edge (i, j) in the graph; multiple divisors correspond to multiple edges. A linear factor of G corresponds to a single edge (i, j) , i.e., to a situation where the vertices i and j are connected by exactly one edge.

Proof of Proposition 3.5. As an auxiliary consideration that will be used repeatedly in the following, we note that condition (b1) is always satisfied for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, with constants α^* and β^* replacing α and β , α^* and β^* not depending on d , and $\varepsilon = \xi = 1/2$, provided that Z is replaced by a standard Gaussian random vector V ; cf. Example A.1 in Leeb (2013b). Moreover, we will use the

inequality $|H| \leq \|S_k - I_k\|^h$. Also, it will be convenient to assume, throughout the proof and without loss of generality, that both G and H are monomials in those elements of $S_k - I_k$ that lie on or above the diagonal. Finally, we may also assume without loss of generality that, in the graph corresponding to G (resp. G^*), each vertex is visited by at least one edge from the graph corresponding to H (resp. H^*), in view of Lemma F.1 in Leeb (2013b) (cf. also the proof of Proposition 2.6 in that reference).

To derive part (i), first note that if H , and hence also H^* , has degree zero, the difference of interest is equal to zero. In the case where $h > 0$, it follows from condition (b1).(a) that $|\mathbb{E}[H]| = d^{-h/2} |\mathbb{E}d^{h/2}H| \leq d^{-h/2}\alpha$. Similarly, we obtain that $|\mathbb{E}[H^*]| \leq d^{-h/2}\alpha^*$, such that the difference in question is bounded as claimed.

For part (ii), we first note that if $m = 0$, we have $G = G^* = 1$ and thus the expression in (3.19) is equal to zero. Otherwise, we have $\mathbb{E}G = 0$, because if G is as in (3.20) and $m \geq 1$, then G contains the factor $(S_k - I_k)_{1,2} = Z'_1 Z_2/d$ and Z_1 has no other occurrence in G . Therefore $\mathbb{E}Z_1 = 0$ and independence of the Z_i 's entails that $\mathbb{E}[G] = 0$. In particular, the expression in (3.19) reduces to $\mathbb{E}[d^g GH] - \mathbb{E}[d^g G^* H^*]$. Now the cases $g < h$, $g = h$ and $g > h$ need separate treatment.

In the case where $g < h$, it follows from (b1).(a) and our auxiliary consideration that $|\mathbb{E}[d^g GH]| = d^{(g-h)/2} |\mathbb{E}[d^{(g+h)/2} GH]| \leq d^{-1/2}\alpha$ and, similarly, $|\mathbb{E}[d^g G^* H^*]| \leq d^{-1/2}\alpha^*$. Hence (3.19) is bounded by $d^{-1/2}(\alpha + \alpha^*)$.

In the case where $g = h$, consider first the subcase where $G = H$. Because G is composed solely of linear factors of $S_k - I_k$ above the diagonal, it follows that GH consists only of quadratic factors above the diagonal, and condition (b1).(b) entails that $|\mathbb{E}d^g GH - 1| \leq \beta d^{-\xi}$. In the Gaussian case, we even have $|\mathbb{E}d^g G^* H^* - 1| \leq \beta^* d^{-1/2}$, such that the expression in (3.19) is bounded by $|\mathbb{E}d^g GH - \mathbb{E}d^g G^* H^*| \leq d^{-\min\{\xi, 1/2\}}(\beta + \beta^*)$. Next, in the subcase where $g = h$ and $G \neq H$, it follows that the graph corresponding to G has an edge that is not matched by an edge in the graph corresponding to H . In other words, the monomial GH has a linear factor, and Condition (b1).(b) entails that $|\mathbb{E}d^g GH| \leq \beta d^{-\xi}$. Because the same applies to $\mathbb{E}d^g G^* H^*$ with the bound $\beta^* d^{-1/2}$, the claim follows.

Finally, consider the case where $g > h$. Because each vertex in the graph corresponding to G is visited by at least one edge from the graph corresponding to H , and because $k \leq 4$, it is easy to see that this can only occur if $g = 3$ and $h = 2$. In particular, we see that G is given by $G = Z'_1 Z_2 Z'_2 Z_3 Z'_3 Z_4/d^3$, and that H is equal to either $H_1 = Z'_1 Z_2 Z'_3 Z_4/d^2$, or $H_2 = Z'_1 Z_3 Z'_2 Z_4/d^2$, or $H_3 = Z'_1 Z_4 Z'_2 Z_3/d^2$. In either case, the vertices 1 and 4 have degree two in the graph corresponding to GH . With this, we obtain that $\mathbb{E}GH_2 = \mathbb{E}GH_3 = d^{-2}\mathbb{E}G_\circ H_\circ$ with $G_\circ = Z'_2 Z_3/d$ and $H_\circ = G_\circ^2$, upon using Lemma F.1(ii) in Leeb (2013b) twice. And we obtain that $\mathbb{E}GH_1 = d^{-2}\mathbb{E}G_\circ H_\odot$, with $G_\circ$ as before and with $H_\odot = (Z'_2 Z_2/d - 1)(Z'_3 Z_3/d - 1)$, by using parts (i) and (iii) of Lemma F.1 in

Leeb (2013b). Either way, we end up with a monomial $G_\circ$ of degree one and a monomial $H_\circ$ or $H_\odot$ of degree two, and that case has already been dealt with earlier.

For part (iii), we note that the case where $g < h$ is treated as in the proof of part (ii), mutatis mutandis.

In the case where $g = h$ and $G \neq H$, it is easy to see that GH has a linear factor (upon separately treating the three subcases $g = 1$, $g = 2$, and $g > 2$), so that either G or H also has a linear factor. Therefore, we have $|\mathbb{E}d^g GH| \leq \beta d^{-\xi}$ and either $|\mathbb{E}d^{g/2} G| \leq \beta d^{-\xi}$ and $|\mathbb{E}d^{h/2} H| \leq \alpha$, or $|\mathbb{E}d^{g/2} G| \leq \alpha$ and $|\mathbb{E}d^{h/2} H| \leq \beta d^{-\xi}$, in view of (b1).(a-b). Because this also holds for G^* and H^* with $\xi = 1/2$ and α^* and β^* replacing α and β , respectively, we see that (3.19) is bounded in, absolute value, by $d^{-\min\{\xi, 1/2\}}(\beta + \beta^* + \alpha\beta + \alpha^*\beta^*)$.

In the case where $g = h$ and $G = H$, we again consider the three subcases where $g = 1$, where $g = 2$, and where $g > 2$. In the subcase where $g = 1$ (and $G = H$), we must have $G = H = (S_k - I_k)_{1,1}$, which corresponds to the case (a) in Proposition 3.5(iii). Note that, here, $\mathbb{E}G = 0$ and that $d\mathbb{E}GH = d\mathbb{E}(Z'_1 Z_1/d - 1)^2 = \text{Var}[Z'_1 Z_1]/d$. And for G^* and H^* , the first four moments of the Gaussian give that $\mathbb{E}G^* = 0$ and that $d\mathbb{E}G^*H^* = 2$. In particular, (3.19) is equal to $\text{Var}[Z'_1 Z_1]/d - 2$, as claimed. In the subcase where $g = 2$ (and $G = H$), we see that case (c) occurs and that $d^2\mathbb{E}(G - \mathbb{E}G)H = d^2\text{Var}[G] = \text{Var}[(Z'_1 Z_2)^2]/d^2$; moreover, it is elementary to verify that $d^2\mathbb{E}(G^* - \mathbb{E}G^*)H^* = d^2\text{Var}[G^*] = 2 + 6/d$. In particular, (3.19) here equals $\text{Var}[(Z'_1 Z_2)^2]/d^2 - 2(1 + 3/d)$. And in the subcase where $g > 2$ (and $G = H$), we see that both G and H are composed only of linear factors above the diagonal of $S_k - I_k$, and GH consists only of quadratic factors above the diagonal, so that $|\mathbb{E}d^g GH - 1| \leq \beta d^{-\xi}$ and $|\mathbb{E}d^g GEH| = |\mathbb{E}d^{g/2} G| |\mathbb{E}d^{h/2} H| \leq \beta^2 d^{-2\xi}$ by condition (b1).(b). Because a similar statement also holds with $\xi = 1/2$ and G^* , H^* , α^* and β^* replacing G , H , α and β , respectively, (3.19) is bounded in absolute value by $d^{-\min\{\xi, 1/2\}}(\beta + \beta^2 + \beta^* + \beta^{*2})$.

Lastly, in the case where $g > h$, the fact that each vertex in the graph corresponding to G is visited by an edge from the graph corresponding to H entails that we either have $h = 1$ and $g = 2$, or $2 \leq h < g \leq k$. If $h = 1$ and $g = 2$, we must have $G = (Z'_1 Z_2/d)^2$ and $H = Z'_1 Z_2/d$. In particular, we see that case (b) of Proposition 3.5(iii) occurs. For such G and H , we obviously have $d^2\mathbb{E}GH = \mathbb{E}(Z'_1 Z_2)^3/d$ and $d^2\mathbb{E}GEH = 0$. And for G^* and H^* , it is easy to see that $d^2\mathbb{E}G^*H^* = d^2\mathbb{E}G^*\mathbb{E}H^* = 0$. Here, (3.19) is equal to $\mathbb{E}(Z'_1 Z_2)^3/d$, as claimed. Finally, consider the case where $2 \leq h < g \leq k$. Here, we obtain that $|\mathbb{E}d^g GH| \leq \beta d^{-\xi}$, in view of condition (b1).(c) (because each vertex of G is visited by an edge from H , it follows that H depends at least on $Z_1, \dots, Z_g$), and also that $|\mathbb{E}d^g G^*H^*| \leq \beta^* d^{-1/2}$. And we obtain that $\mathbb{E}H = \mathbb{E}H^* = 0$ by Lemma F.1(i) in Leeb (2013b), because the number of vertices of H is at least g (as edges in H visit all vertices in G), and because $h < g$. Altogether, we see that the expression in (3.19) is bounded in absolute value by $d^{-\min\{\xi, 1/2\}}(\beta + \beta^*)$. $\square$

References

- W. Bryc and J. Wesołowski. Conditional moments of q -Meixner processes. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, **131**:415–441, 2005.
- S. Cambanis, S. Huang, and G. Simons. On the theory of elliptically contoured distributions. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **11**:368–385, 1981.
- Y. Chikuse. *Statistics on special manifolds*, volume 174 of *Lecture Notes in Statist.* Springer, New York, NY, 2003.
- S. N. Cohen. Quasi-sure analysis, aggregation and dual representations of sub-linear expectations in general spaces. *Electron. J. Probab.*, **17**:1–15, 2012.
- R. D. Cook and S. Weisberg. Discussion of “Sliced inverse regression for dimension reduction,” by K.-C. Li. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **86**:328–332, 1991.
- M. L. Eaton. A characterization of spherical distributions. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **20**:272–276, 1986.
- P. Hall and K.-C. Li. On almost linearity of low dimensional projections from high dimensional data. *Ann. Statist.*, **21**:867–889, 1993.
- J. Hoffmann-Jørgensen. *Probability with a view toward statistics*, volume 1. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY, 1994a.
- J. Hoffmann-Jørgensen. *Probability with a view toward statistics*, volume 2. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY, 1994b.
- M. C. Jones. Constant local dependence. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **64**:148–155, 1998.
- J. D. Kečkić and P. M. Vasić. Some inequalities for the gamma function. *Publ. Inst. Math.*, **11**:107–114, 1971.
- H. Leeb. On the conditional distribution of low-dimensional projections from high-dimensional data. *Ann. Statist.*, **41**:464–483, 2013a.
- H. Leeb. Supplement to “On the conditional distribution of low-dimensional projections from high-dimensional data”. doi:10.1214/12-AOS1081SUPP, 2013b.
- K.-C. Li. Sliced inverse regression for dimension reduction. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **86**:316–327, 1991.
- A. Plucińska. On a stochastic process determined by the conditional expectation and the conditional variance. *Stochastics*, **10**:115–129, 1983.
- A. Qu, B. G. Lindsay, and L. Lu. Highly efficient aggregate unbiased estimation functions approach for correlated data with missing at random. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **105**:194–204, 2010.
- C. R. Rao. *Linear Statistical Inference and Its Applications*. Wiley, New York, NY, 2nd edition, 1973.
- T. Tarpey and R. D. Sanders. Linear conditional expectation for discretized distributions. *J. Appl. Statist.*, **31**:361–371, 2004.
- J. Wesołowski. Stochastic processes with linear conditional expectation and quadratic conditional variance. *Probability and Mathematical Statistics*, **14**:33–44, 1993.